

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Monday, the 3rd February 1936.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the Hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT :

- | | |
|---|---|
| Reddi Nayudu, <i>Kt.</i> , The Hon. Rai Bahadur Sir K. V. | Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S. |
| Pannirselvam, The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. | Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I. Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad, Raj Kumar M. A. |
| Souter, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., The Hon. Sir Charles. | Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C. Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A. |
| Bracken, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. | Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V. |
| Raja of Bobbili, K.C.I.E., The Hon. the Rajan, The Hon. Mr. P. T. | Nanjappa Bahadur, Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. |
| Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. | Narasa Reddi, Mr. T. |
| Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur. | Narasimhaswami, Rao Sahib D. V. |
| Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur. | Natesa Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. Obi Reddi, Mr. C. |
| Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K. Appadurai Pillai, Diwan Bahadur A. Arasu, Mr. V. T. | Palat, Mr. R. M. |
| Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B. | Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R. |
| Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. | Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G. |
| Basu Dev, Mr. C. | Patro, K.C.I.E., Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. |
| Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K. | Pattabhiramayya, Mr. K. |
| Bhanoji Rao, Sri A. V. | Peddi Raju, Mr. P. |
| Boag, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. G. T. | Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B. |
| Devadasan, Mr. M. | Premayya, Mr. G. R. |
| Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V. | Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V. |
| Foulkes, Mr. G. F. F. | Raja of Kallikote, The. |
| Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M. | Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K. |
| Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A. | Ramakrishna Reddi, Mr. A. |
| Indrayya, Mr. C. | Ramalingam Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur T. A. |
| Iswaran Pillai, Mr. I. C. | Ramalinga Reddi, Mr. C. |
| Jagannatha Raju, Rao Bahadur G. | Ramamurti, Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala. |
| Jagannatham, Mr. H. M. | Raman Menon, Mr. K. P. |
| Javad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur. | Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S. |
| Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C. | Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M. |
| Jones, I.C.S., Mr. C. E. | Rameswara Rao, Mr. G. |
| Kesavaramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K. | Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A. |
| Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C. | Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B. |
| Koti Reddi, Mr. K. | Ratnavelu Thevar, Mr. P. |
| Krishnamurti, Rao Bahadur D. | Reid, Mr. D. M. |
| Kumararaja of Venkatagiri, The. | Rukmani Lakshmipathi, Mrs. A. |
| Langley, Mr. W. K. M. | Russell, I.C.S., Mr. T. B. |
| Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R. | Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur Mahmud. |
| Maharaja of Parlakimedi, The. | Scott Brown, I.C.S., Mr. W. |
| Manikkavelu Nayakur, Mr. M. A. | Shetty, Mr. A. B. |
| Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M. | Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N. |
| Moses, Mr. P. C. | Smith, Mr. J. M. |
| | Soundara Pandiyar, Mr. W. P. A. |
| | Sreshta, Mr. M. S. |
| | Srinivasan, Diwan Bahadur R. |

[3rd February 1936]

PRESENT—cont.

Sriramulu, Mr. G.
 Subbarayan, Dr. P.
 Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
 Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
 Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
 Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan
 Sahib.
 Thangal, Mr. P. M.

Uzielli, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. H. R.
 Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.
 Vedachala Mudaliyar, Rao Sahib M.
 Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M.
 Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
 Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.
 Zamindar of Bodinayakanur, The.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Administration of Justice

Selection of District Munsifs by the High Court.

* 691 Q.—MR. M. DEVADASAN: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the High Court selected District Munsifs this year;
- (b) if so, whether they called for applications;
- (c) if not, why not; and
- (d) how many of the Munsifs selected belonged to the City of Madras; and how many to the mufassal?

A.—The High Court has invited applications in its notification, dated 10th September 1935, published on page 1102 of Part II of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 17th September 1935, and the selection will be made by about the middle of February 1936. A short list was, however, drawn up in August 1935 to supplement the list prepared in December 1934, as the latter had been exhausted and it became necessary to add a few more names. Eight candidates were chosen from the applicants of 1934. Fresh applications were not called for as there was no time to call for and consider fresh applications. The candidates chosen are those who would have been selected in 1934 if the 1934 list had been drawn up for 24 candidates instead of 16. Out of the eight candidates chosen, five were from Madras and three from the mufassal.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“ May I know from the Hon. the Law Member from which community or communities the district munsifs are recruited? ”

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—“ I want notice, Sir.”

Mr. A. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI:—“ Is it a fact that the political leanings of the candidates are taken into consideration in making the selection? ”

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—“ I am not in a position to answer, Sir.”

3rd February 1936]

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—" May I know what the tests are that are applied for the selection? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" The High Court knows."

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—" Are there instructions in the matter? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" The Government cannot give any instructions to them, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know whether the Government are in possession of information regarding the recent selection? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" No, Sir."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I know whether the Government is prepared to advise the High Court that more mufassal lawyers should be selected as we find that almost all of them are lawyers from Madras? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" The hon. Member is aware that the Civil Courts Act gives the power to the High Court and not to the Government."

Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—" Instead of advising or instructing them, the Government may communicate the wishes of the representatives of the people in the matter to the High Court? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" I should think it is open to the hon. Members of this House to address the High Court on the point."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Arising out of the answer given, may I know whether the High Court has not prescribed any rules as to how the candidates are to be selected, or whether the Government are unaware of them? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" I am unaware of them."

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—" May I know whether the High Court has taken into consideration the interests of the West Coast districts? "

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" I cannot answer that. I may say they are expected to take them into consideration."

Electricity

Rate charged under the Pykara Hydro-electric Scheme for consumption of electricity for agricultural purposes.

* 692 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) what the rate charged is for consumption of electricity for agricultural purposes under the Pykara hydro-electric system and the proposed Mettur hydro-electric scheme;

[3rd February 1936]

(b) whether representations have been received to lower the rate; if so, from whom;

(c) whether the opinion of the Director of Agriculture was obtained in the matter; and

(d) whether final orders have been passed thereon and if so, whether a copy of it will be placed on the table?

A.—(a) *Pykara system*.—One anna per unit.

Mettur system.—Rates have not yet been settled. It is expected that they will not be higher than those in force in the Pykara system.

(b) Yes. From the District Board of Coimbatore and the District Agricultural Association, Coimbatore.

(c) No.

(d) The question whether it is economically possible to reduce the rates is under the examination of the Chief Engineer for Electricity.

Re-examination of the scheme for the electrification of Kodumudi, Coimbatore district.

* 693 Q.—MR. K. A. NACHYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the re-examination of the question of electrification of the town of Kodumudi in Coimbatore district and carrying out another survey, referred to in answer to question No. 396, dated the 1st November 1935, are in progress and when they are likely to be completed; and

(b) what the minimum percentage of profit required to be realized under this scheme is?

A.—(a) The Chief Engineer for Electricity reports that a fresh study of the load conditions since made has confirmed the previous report that the scheme will not be remunerative and that it is not proposed to proceed with the electrification of the town.

(b) Extensions to the Pykara Distribution System are generally undertaken only in cases where the total additional investment does not exceed eight times the estimated average annual revenue.

Wells in North Arcot district suitable for electrical pumping.

* 694 Q.—MRS. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of wells in each of the taluks of the North Arcot district where electrical pumping can be introduced;

(b) which the taluk is which has the largest number of wells per square mile suitable for electrical pumping;

(c) in what taluks the Government are laying the transmission lines according to the programme already settled; and

3rd February 1936]

(d) within what period the Government propose to complete the programme of agricultural pumping in the district?

A.—(a) The information is furnished in the statement ^a annexed.

(b) Investigation regarding wells suitable for electrical pumping in the district has not yet been made.

(c) The Electricity department expects to complete in 1937 the work of laying transmission lines and give supply of power in Tiruppattur, Gudiyattam, Vellore and Walajapet taluks and in 1938 in the taluks of Chengam, Tiruvannamalai, Polur and Arni.

(d) No extensive rural electrification programme has been prepared. In areas where Government will distribute energy direct to the consumers, promising areas will be selected as soon as supply becomes available, and such areas will be surveyed and developed.

Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—"With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know whether it will not be possible on the part of the Government to prepare a scheme or rather a programme before the supply of energy becomes available?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—"I think the answer covers that idea."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the fact that there are a large number of wells in the North Arcot district, will the Government make up their minds speedily to undertake the supply of energy to rural areas?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—"Haste is waste, they say, and I think the hon. Member will certainly expect the Government to take sufficient time to come to a correct decision."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know what exactly the Government means by haste?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—"Exactly the same thing which the hon. Member is meaning by the word."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know whether the Hon. Member knows what I mean by it?"

Police

Assault by soldiers on pedestrians near the Munro Statue, Madras.

* 695 Q.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the Hon. the Home Member be pleased to state with reference to the answer to question No. 521-A regarding the attack by the soldiers on T. N. Sundaraman and five others—

(a) whether the investigation of the complaint has been since completed; if so, what the result of the same is; and

[3rd February 1936]

(b) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—The investigation made by the police showed that on the night in question a party of British soldiers did assault the complainants. The Military authorities held an identification parade on the 19th November 1935 but as the complainants failed to identify the alleged assailants further action could not be taken.

Irrigation

Failure of freshes in the Cauvery channels of Namakkal taluk.

* 696 Q.—MR. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that on account of the rains in the Tanjore Delta, and consequent shutting up of water tightly in the Mettur Dam, failures of water in the Cauvery channels of Namakkal taluk have occurred;

(b) how many times such failures have occurred so far; and

(c) what the loss caused to the ryots is by such failures, and how long such failures lasted during each time?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Four times, once in each of the months of August, October, November and December 1935.

(c) The extent of loss due to short supply cannot be readily estimated. It was probably slight. The duration of shortage in supply was five days in August, four days in October, four days in November and about six days in December 1935.

Failure of freshes in the Cauvery channels in Namakkal taluk, Salem district.

* 697 Q.—MR. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that water has failed in the Cauvery channels in Namakkal taluk of Salem district during October last on account of stoppage of water at Mettur owing to the fact of the area at Tanjore and Trichinopoly having sufficient supply on account of freshes in the tributaries (Noyyal and Amaravathi) which join the river Cauvery down below the point where the Korambu for Salem area exists;

(b) if so, how long water has failed in the channels;

(c) what will be the estimated loss of crops on account of such a failure;

3rd February 1936]

(d) how many such failures have occurred during the course of 1934 and 1935;

(e) what action the Government have taken to remedy such a defect; and

(f) whether any orders have been passed in the matter and, if so, whether a copy of it will be placed on the table?

A.—(a) to (d) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to question No. 686 on 23rd February 1935 and to question No. 696.

(e) & (f) The conditions of supply for the channels in the Salem district are being carefully examined. When the shortage occurred in November 1935, Korambus were formed at the heads of the channels.

Land Revenue Administration

Restrictions on the sale of property mortgaged under the Land Improvement Act or Agricultural Loans Act.

* 698 Q.—MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether a pattadar who borrows under the Land Improvement Act or Agricultural Loans Act is prohibited from selling his property subject to bearing the burden of the loan taken by him;

(b) whether the subsequent purchaser is being compelled to pay up the full loan irrespective of the instalments originally agreed upon;

(c) whether certain Tahsildars in Anantapur are collecting the full amount in one lump from such subsequent alienees; and

(d) whether the methods adopted by such Tahsildars are authorized by any rules or Government Orders?

A.—(a) No.

(b) According to the rules, the balance of the loan outstanding on the date of the transfer with interest thereon at the same rate at which the original loan was granted, is calculated and the amount is made repayable in equal annual instalments.

(c) & (d) The Government have no information on the point mentioned in clause (c) but have called for a report.

MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"May I know whether a report was received after the question was asked?"

THE HON. SIR CHARLES SOUTER:—"I have not seen any report. I understand it has not been received."

MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"Apart from that, may I request the Hon. Member to circularize all the Tahsildars in the Presidency inasmuch as they have been practically breaking the rules?"

[3rd February 1936]

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—"I have no information, Sir, that such is the practice."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"As the practice has been going on in the Anantapur district for that matter, I have brought it to the notice of the Hon. Member."

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—"I hope the report on the matter will be received shortly."

Legality of the imposition of separate water-rate on paimash wet lands in inam and proprietary estates in Salem.

* 699 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether legal opinion has been obtained on the registered notices issued by some of the inamdars and proprietors of estates, in the Cauvery-irrigated area of Salem district questioning the authority of the Government to impose separate water-rate on paimash wet lands in their estates;

(b) if so, whether a copy of it will be laid on the table;

(c) whether the registered notices have been considered and orders have been passed by the Government thereon; and

(d) if so, whether a copy of the order will be placed on the table?

A.—(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to question No. 186 on 9th August 1935.

(c) & (d) The Government are awaiting a further report from the Board of Revenue in the matter.

Legality of the enhancement of water-rate in Salem as per G.O. No. 736, Revenue, dated 12th April 1934.

* 700 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether registered notices have been received by the Government or by the Collector questioning the authority of Government in the matter of the issue of G.O. No. 736, Revenue, dated 12th April 1934, increasing the water-rate in the Cauvery irrigated area of Salem district and threatening civil action;

(b) if so, whether any legal opinion has been obtained in the matter, and whether any reply notices have been issued; and

(c) whether copies of the legal opinion and the reply notices issued will be placed on the table?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to question No. 186 on 9th August 1935.

3rd February 1936]

Local Self-Government

Appointment of a personal assistant to the Collector of South Kanara for managing the affairs of the District Board.

* 701 Q.—MR. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether a personal assistant to the Collector has been appointed to manage the affairs of the District Board of South Kanara; if so, from which fund is his salary to be met and under what provision of law is it to be met; and

(b) what the state of parties is among the newly elected members of the District Board of South Kanara with reference to Congress candidates and their opponents?

A.—(a) A personal assistant has been appointed to the President, District Board, South Kanara. His pay and allowances will be met from the funds of the South Kanara District Board under the provisions of the Madras Local Boards Act.

(b) The Government have no information.

Postponement of the date of election to the North Arcot District Board.

* 702 Q.—MR. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage the new general elections in the North Arcot District Board are; when they are likely to be completed;

(b) what the reasons are for putting off the elections;

(c) whether orders have been passed fixing a date for the expiry of the present district boards in North Arcot district; if so, whether a copy of it will be placed on the table; and

(d) whether the date originally fixed for the purpose has been shifted and, if so, what the reasons therefor are?

A.—(a) The Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards has been asked to commence the election in February 1936 and to complete them before 15th March 1936.

(b), (c) & (d) Attention is invited to the notification on the subject published on page 609 of Part I-A of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 24th December 1935.

Revival of tolls.

* 703 Q.—MR. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether consideration with regard to the re-introduction of tolls, as mentioned in question No. 30 answered on 5th August 1935 has been over; and

[3rd February 1936]

(b) if so, whether a copy of the final order passed in the matter will be placed on the table?

A.—Yes. The Government have decided that no legislation should at present be undertaken to re-introduce the levy of tolls.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know whether the Government have under consideration any other proposals for compensating the local bodies for the loss suffered by them on account of the abolition of tolls? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The Government are proposing to make provision for special maintenance grants."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know what amount will be set apart? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" About ten lakhs."

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Petition from Mr. P. V. Nataraja Mudaliyar and others for the construction of an easy flight of steps over the seven hills of Tirupati.

* 704 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether any petition was presented to the Government by Mr. P. V. Nataraja Mudaliyar and hundreds of other worshippers of Sri Venkateswaraswami of Tirupati praying for the construction of an easy flight of steps over a causeway to relieve the sufferings of the orthodox pilgrims who have to fulfil their vows by climbing up the seven hills of Tirupati on foot;

(b) whether the Government received the petition and what, if any, was the action thereon;

(c) whether the Government referred the petition to the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Committee, and if so, what reply did they receive from the Committee; and

(d) whether the orders passed by the Government on the petition were communicated to any of the signatories to the petition?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b), (c) & (d) The petition was transferred to the Commissioner, Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams, for disposal.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" With reference to the answer to clauses (b), (c) and (d), may I know what the reply is of the Commissioner, Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The Devasthanam Committee is to deal with the matter."

3rd February 1936]

Rao, Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"What is the opinion of the Government when the orthodox Hindus ask for special facilities?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The Government have not come to any decision yet."

Co-operation

Debit to the District Bank of the cost of notifications regarding the liquidation of rural societies.

* 705 Q.—MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the District Bank is called upon to pay the cost of notifications in case of liquidation of any rural society within its area;

(b) whether the Government give any advance to cover such incidental expenses and recover it out of the realizations;

(c) the average period for which liquidation proceedings have continued in general and such period in the Anantapur district in particular; and

(d) whether the cost of the notifications regarding liquidation is entirely borne by the Government or whether it is recoverable with or without any interest?

A.—(a), (b) & (d) Clause (a) of rule XVII of the Rules under the Madras Co-operative Societies Act, VI of 1932, provides that the appointment of the liquidator of a co-operative society shall be notified by the Registrar in the *Fort St. George Gazette*. Accordingly, notifications regarding the cancellation of the registration and the appointment of liquidators of rural societies are sent to the Superintendent, Government Press, for publication in the *Fort St. George Gazette*. The costs are entirely borne by Government as the issue of a notification is a statutory duty imposed on the Registrar.

(c) The periods for which liquidation proceedings continue depend upon several factors and mainly upon the amount of assets to be recovered and the nature of the persons from whom the assets have to be recovered—their solvency, their tendency to litigation, etc. Generally, it takes about two to four years to complete the liquidation proceedings in societies and, in a large number of cases, it takes about three years. In the Anantapur district, liquidation proceedings are closed in about two years on the average.

MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"The answer says: 'The costs are entirely borne by Government as the issue of a notification is a statutory duty imposed on the Registrar.' May I request the Hon. Minister to order the refund of such costs collected from parties?"

[3rd February 1936]

The Hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"If any amounts have been paid, I shall ask the Registrar to consider the question of returning them."

UNSTARRED QUESTION

Electricity

Proposal for the establishment of a central electric generating scheme for Vizagapatam.

706 Q.—The ZAMINDAR OF KIRLAMPUDI: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are contemplating a central electric generating scheme for Vizagapatam; if so, whether it is a hydraulic or a thermal scheme;

(b) whether they have investigated the scheme and prepared plans for the same; and

(c) if so, what the expenditure incurred for that purpose is?

A.—(a) Yes. It is a thermal scheme.

(b) Yes. Report and preliminary plans have been prepared.

(c) The work was not carried out by a staff specially engaged for the purpose but was attended to by the ordinary staff of the Electricity department. It is not therefore possible to state the actual expenditure incurred on the work. A sum of Rs. 430 has been incurred by way of travelling allowances of the officers who carried out field investigation.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* POSTPONEMENT OF THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTH KANARA DISTRICT BOARD.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"Sir, under Standing Order No. 19, I move—

'that the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the action of the Government postponing the election of the President of the District Board of South Kanara.'

Mr. AHMED MEERAN:—"I second it."

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"May I ask the hon. Member who has moved this how the motion which was not urgent last week has come to be urgent this week?"

3rd February 1936]

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"The point is this, Sir. The postponement of the election of the president has given rise to a lot of complications. It cannot be said that there is no district board functioning in South Kanara. There is a district board and its members are entitled to the rights and duties attached to them as members of the district board, and they have consequently tried to use those rights and liabilities which fall to them. For instance, they have sent a requisition to the *ex officio* President, asking him to convene a meeting for the election of the president. The Collector, who is the *ex officio* President, has refused to accede to the request. So, under Schedule II of the Local Boards Act, the members have called for a meeting themselves. We do not know what is to happen. I hear that the meeting is coming off on the 12th or 13th instant. Nobody knows where the district board members stand exactly. The other day it was not because it was not urgent that it was not pressed, but because I found that Dr. Subbarayan had given notice of a short notice question on this subject and it was a motion under the Standing Orders wherein no censure was involved. But I now move for adjournment under Standing Order No. 19, which stands quite on a different footing and is a motion involving censure. I may also say that Dr. Subbarayan's short notice question has not been accepted."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, the incidents which the hon. Member has just mentioned occurred before the meeting of this Council, and if it is the opinion of the hon. Member that the matter is urgent, he ought to have brought it even during the first few days of the sitting of the Council. A number of questions on this subject have been received, and two of them have been already answered, and the others will be answered in the course of this sitting. The hon. Member first gave notice of one motion, and he has made some alteration subsequently. I submit, Sir, that the matter is neither urgent nor definite. On these grounds, I wish to object to the motion."

Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Was not the reply of the Collector received only a few days back?"

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the motion is in order. I wish to know whether any hon. Member objects to the motion."

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I have taken objection, Sir."

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Those hon. Members who support the motion will rise in their places. (After a count.) The required number of Members have not risen in their places. So, leave is not given to the motion."

III.—BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS CITY MUNICIPAL ACT, 1919, FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL No. 11 OF 1934)—*cont.*

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The House will continue the consideration of the City Municipal Act amending Bill."

[3rd February 1936]

Clause 169.

Section 344.

Rao Bahadur P. C. MUTHU CHETTIYAR spoke in Tamil and the following is an English rendering of the speech:—

“ I move that—

‘ section 344 be omitted. ’

11-15 The object of this section is to make re-vaccination compulsory
a.m. throughout the country. There are some difficulties if such compulsion is introduced which I wish to mention to the House. It is not that people are unaware of the benefits of vaccination. Already there exists a sort of compulsion and a certain amount of harassment is caused to the people in this matter. If re-vaccination also is made compulsory, it will only add to their troubles. In certain seasons and during certain epidemics, there may be necessity for re-vaccination. Even in such a time people do not readily submit to re-vaccination. If this provision is introduced, there would be greater unnecessary harassment. The number of officers will have to be increased under the system of compulsion which means more oppression, for people do not submit to vaccination of their own accord. My own experience is this: common people at seeing these sanitary officers dressed in hat and boot, accompanied by a number of peons, take fright and run away. But these officers drag them out and vaccinate them. Moreover, since the vaccinator has to inoculate a number of people in a short time, the needles are not properly kept clean. In many cases, soon after vaccination the arms begin to swell.

“ I shall give another instance of the way in which vaccinators coerce people to get vaccinated. A vaccinator once came to a house and saw a girl and went in to get her vaccinated. But the girl was one who had come of age and as soon as she saw this man she ran inside. But the vaccinator pursued her into the house, and the girl hid herself in some corner; the vaccinator not finding her went away. This did not occur in any far off place, but took place in a house next to mine and so I could testify to it. Even if women vaccinators are employed to deal with women folk, still, compulsion should not be resorted to.

“ Another matter is that it is said that medicines do not act upon people who have been vaccinated. With these words, I move my amendment.”

The motion was duly seconded.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“ Sir, I beg to oppose the amendment of my hon. Friend. In these days when people have known the value of vaccination it will be wrong to say that compulsion should not exist. Leaving the case of rural parts, in the City I should say

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai]

3rd February 1936]

in the interest of my own people living in the unhealthy parts, it is highly necessary that there should be a system of compulsory vaccination. Otherwise, I am afraid, there may be danger to public health."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, a provision regarding compulsory vaccination is already there in the existing Act, and it has worked for so many years. The only change proposed now is as regards re-vaccination. When it is conceded that vaccination is desirable and necessary and that medical opinion considers that after a period of time the immunity disappears and re-vaccination is essential, it logically follows that the Corporation should be invested with powers to enforce re-vaccination whenever medical officers consider it necessary. Therefore, I oppose this amendment."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I think I must support the motion of Mr. P. C. Muthu Chettiyar. Whether vaccination is at all necessary and desirable, I venture to submit, is a debatable question. In England itself there is a school of thought which has held that vaccination is a relic of the old barbarous days and should be abandoned. The theory there is that you must prevent people from catching the disease; you must make them live in such conditions so that they may not easily succumb to any disease that may be prevalent. Leaving alone that and coming to the re-vaccination business, the Hon. the Chief Minister said that the effects of the first vaccination disappear after a certain period. Now I am waiting to hear from him what is the period for which this vaccination is said to have effect. If it is six months or a year, does he contend that every year or six months a man should subject himself to vaccination? I think the question need only to be put in that form in order to show its absurdity. It is most unjust to make re-vaccination in addition to vaccination compulsory; no man should be subjected to this re-vaccination periodically. I for one believe that no one cares to be sent even to heaven by compulsion. If any body compels, he will say, 'thank you, I will look after myself.'"

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"If the hon. Member wants to go to heaven he can go himself without causing danger to the public, but here if a man is not vaccinated or re-vaccinated he will contract disease which may prove contagious. Therefore the analogy does not hold good here. We have to see whether there is public danger or not. No doubt there is a difference of opinion as to whether this vaccination prevents smallpox and other diseases, but still we find from practical experience that smallpox has been reduced to a considerable extent in this country as a result of vaccination; and the Hon. the Chief Minister has said that if vaccination is considered necessary and desirable it follows that re-vaccination also should be resorted to on the same grounds. Mere theorists may say that vaccination is not necessary. If my hon. Friend (Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar) had said that vaccination is positively bad, then vaccination as well as re-vaccination should

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [3rd February 1936]

be stopped. So long as it is stated that it is a debatable question, and all these years vaccination has proved beneficial to the people, there is absolutely no reason why we should doubt it, unless it is positively proved that it is harmful. Therefore I oppose the amendment."

* Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR :—" Sir, this question also came up some years ago and I have studied the whole literature on the subject; all the public health literature in England as well as in some other countries show that medical opinion is not certain about it. There is equally a balance of opinion among doctors who have experimented in this affair to the effect that the evils arising from vaccination are great and those from re-vaccination are greater still. For instance statistics have been gathered now, and they show that diseases arising from vaccination, such as syphilis, consumption, leprosy, erysipelas, eczema, convulsion, etc., are the results of vaccination. Now vaccination is made with the pus that is taken from an animal, commonly the calf, and when it is taken, it is mixed up with certain other matters but all these generally get rotten before they are injected into the pure blood of a human being. Now we have got two disadvantages. The first disadvantage is that the pus of an animal is pressed into the body of a human being. That is certainly an unclean thing to do. Secondly we do not know from what disease the calf from which the pus is taken has been suffering. Even with regard to the diseases of human beings, doctors take a number of days to diagnose what exactly they are. The present state of the science is such that they do a lot of experiment with a patient before they are able to diagnose a disease. In the case of diseases of the animals the difficulty of diagnosis is greater. Our doctors do not know what disease a particular calf is suffering from. We have got statistics which go to show that syphilis is one of the ordinary diseases which the cows and calves suffer from. When that is the case it is a dangerous practice to inject their pus into the system of the human beings. I know of a case in Chittoor where a man who was vaccinated, had not advanced three steps before he fell down and died. The doctors were not able to tell us the reason for his death. I know of another case where a man having been re-vaccinated, fell a victim to syphilis and has not yet recovered from it. There are several other such cases. When doctors differ, who can decide? Well, certainly we have a right to decide and we should not put people to the risk of getting unknown diseases. I would therefore suggest that if the Government are very anxious to vaccinate or re-vaccinate the people, they must take into account the status, the knowledge and the ability of the people before they take the step. If the surroundings of a particular locality are such that vaccination is considered necessary there, then I suggest that properly trained men who know the use of the knife or the syringe should alone be sent and vaccination should not be done in a haphazard manner. Also the lymph used should be fresh and not a rotten mixture of some bad stuff. In the mufassal, there is the risk of the pus prepared at Guindy or elsewhere getting spoiled before it is put into use. There is this additional risk in the case of the mufassal and parents are

11-30
a.m.

3rd February 1936] [Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar]

very much afraid to send their children fresh from the mothers' womb for being vaccinated in this manner. I would therefore suggest that, as in England, some exemptions ought to be given. There it is optional. People register their names at least six months before the due period and say that they have got objections or that they are able to provide themselves with preventives against small-pox. They are therefore allowed to be in charge of their children without vaccination. Of course the argument will at once be trotted out: What do you say of a place which is full of dirt and filth? You cannot apply the same principle there. Some discrimination ought to be used first as regards the persons to be vaccinated. If they are living in healthy surroundings, there is no reason why this animal pus should be pressed into the fresh bodies of the little children there. Once, a deputy collector got his child vaccinated and the child did not recover from the disease and died. Lord Pentland did not allow his children to be vaccinated. He would drive the vaccinator from his compound with a horsewhip. When he was Governor he would never allow it. Therefore there is reason behind this objection. The provision requires considerable modification. When Dr. Subbarayan introduced his Bill, he gave a promise that he would look into this question. What ever it is, I am of opinion that some discrimination must be used as regards the persons to be vaccinated, the place, the surroundings and the person who is injecting the vaccine. Once I had occasion to be prosecuted. The doctor entered the witness-box and, in the course of the cross-examination, admitted that the lymph used was not the one mentioned in the Municipal Act. In cross-examination I brought out the facts that the material brought to be used was not of the kind that was required according to the Municipal Act. Therefore there is considerable danger in allowing one's child to be vaccinated in this manner. I would therefore very earnestly request the Hon. the Chief Minister to take into consideration the surroundings in each individual case so that the necessary exemption may be granted. The indiscriminate use of the vaccine by people who do not know to what dangers they are exposing the children may also be avoided."

Rao Bahadur P. C. MUTHU CHETTIYAR expressed his intention to press the motion.

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" May not the motion be put in two parts, Sir? "

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" There is only one motion, i.e., to omit section 344."

The motion was put and lost.

Clauses 169, 170, 171 and 175 were put and carried.

Clauses 175-A, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194 and 195 were then put and carried.

[3rd February 1936]

Clause 196.

Section 383.

* Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"Sir, I move—

'After the word and figures "section 179," the word and figures "section 186" shall be inserted.'

Sir, we have included section 186 on account of the fact that considerable delay has been caused and much inconvenience has been found to exist in consequence of its omission. In cases in which the Corporation enters into an agreement with persons who want to construct flush-out latrines, they are unable to enforce it on account of the fact that there is no charge on the property. If the recovery of the amount from the party is made a charge on the property, it will be easy for the Corporation to collect the amount. On that account we have proposed to include section 186 also in this clause. This is an official amendment."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second the amendment."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 196 as amended, and clauses 197, 198, 199, 200, 201 and 202 were put and carried.

Clause 203.

Section 394.

* Mr. T. B. RUSSELL:—"Sir, I beg to move—

'In line 2, after the word "inserted," the following shall be added, namely:—

"and for the words 'imposed or assessed,' the words 'imposed, assessed or recoverable' shall be substituted".'

It is necessary to have this word 'recoverable' to apply to the word 'tax' which comes just before."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 203 as amended and clauses 204 and 205 were put and carried

New clause 205-A.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name, viz.—

'After clause 205, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"205-A. In section 400 of the said Act, after the words 'and every councillor' insert the words 'or alderman'".'

11-45 P.m. Mr. President is in the same position as the Councillor and he is supposed to make himself liable for any loss, waste or misapplication. Hence it is necessary to include alderman also in this clause."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The new clause 205-A was put and carried.

Clauses 206 to 212 were put and carried.

3rd February 1936]

Clause 213.

Section 414 (b).

* Mr. T. B. RUSSELL:—" I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

11-45
a.m.

' In clause (b) for the words " a meeting of the newly elected and appointed councillors " the following words shall be substituted, namely, " a meeting of the persons newly elected or appointed as councillors " . '

This change is made because those persons who have been elected do not actually become councillors until the old councillors retire."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 213 as amended and clause 214 were put and carried.

Clause 216.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—" I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

' In new rule 1-C, for the words " serial numbers " occurring in item (i), the words " serial number " shall be substituted. '

Sir, this is a formal amendment moved to correct a mistake in drafting."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 216 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 216-A.

* Mr. T. B. RUSSELL:—" I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name and which runs as follows:—

' For clause 216-A of the Bill, the following clause shall be substituted namely:—

" 216-A. For rule 7 of the said schedule IV, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

" 7. Companies shall be assessed by the Commissioner on the following scale:—

Paid up Capital.

Lakhs of rupees.	Half yearly tax.
	RS.
A. Less than one	30
B. One and more than one, but less than two	50
C. Two and more than two, but less than three	100
D. Three and more than three, but less than five	150
E. Five and more than five, but less than ten	250
F. Ten and more than ten, but less than twenty	500
G. Twenty and more than twenty	1,000

[Mr. T. B. Russell]

[3rd February 1936]

Provided that any company, the head or a principal office of which is not in the city and which shows that its gross income received in or from the city in the year immediately preceding the year of taxation :—

(a) has not exceeded Rs. 5,000 ..	Shall pay only 25 rupees per half year ;
(b) has exceeded Rs. 5,000, but has not exceeded Rs. 10,000 ..	Shall pay only 50 rupees per half year ;
(c) has exceeded Rs. 10,000, but has not exceeded Rs. 20,000 ..	Shall pay only Rs. 100 per half year ; and ;
(d) has exceeded Rs. 20,000 ..	Shall pay per half year 100 rupees together with a sum calculated at the rate of 25 rupees per half year for every 5,000 rupees, or part thereof, of gross income in excess of Rs. 20,000 subject to a maximum half-yearly tax of 1,000 rupees.

Provided further that when a company the head or a principal office of which is not in the city becomes liable to tax for the first time, it shall pay in the first year a tax of 25 rupees ; but if the gross income of the company during such year is subsequently found to have exceeded 5,000 rupees, it shall pay the tax calculated in accordance with the abovementioned scale less the initial payment of 25 rupees."

Sir, this is a complicated question and it was gone into at great length by the Select Committee and after consultation with the various interests affected, what I consider to be a reasonable compromise was arrived at. The change that I now propose to make is merely of a verbal nature. It will be observed from the copy of the Bill as approved by the Select Committee that the first item begins with the highest of the figures and goes down. Now the lowest amount comes first in the table and as you read down the value increases."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 216-A as amended, and clauses 217, 217-A, 218 and 219 were put and carried.

Clause 220.

Schedule IV—Rule 14.

* Mr. D. M. REID :—" I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows :—

'Delete rule 14 added by the Select Committee and renumber rule 13-A as rule 14.'

Sir, in moving this amendment, I would mention that amendment No. 20 which we previously postponed is consequential on this, as are also amendments Nos. 200, 203 and 204 all of which are in my name.

" I look upon this question as possibly the most important in this amending Bill. It has come up now suddenly on a thin House after months of waiting. This Bill has been in preparation for a long time. During that time, for six years, I had the honour of being a Councillor

3rd February 1936] [Mr. D. M. Reid]

of the Corporation of Madras. It was always evident that our Municipal Act could and should be improved and that certain sections in particular required amendment. These were discussed among Councillors from time to time, as the Government are aware. Of all these matters, there was one particular subject of continual difficulty which affected every Councillor to a greater or less degree. I came into touch with it with increasing intensity as time went on.

"The basis of taxation in this city, as is in general for all municipalities throughout the world, is on the value of property in order to pay for the amenities given to those who enjoy the use of that property. All properties are assessed on the basis of their rental value. It is therefore a matter of extreme importance to all who own property that these rental values should be correctly assessed, for two reasons, (1) that the owner himself shall be assessed accurately on the rentals which he receives, or on the rental which he would receive if he were not himself the occupier, (2) that all other owners of property should be equally accurately assessed so that the burden should not fall unfairly on some owners of property as against others.

"In the present City Act, the machinery for assessing these values is as follows:—(1) the officers of the Corporation inspect the property, obtain all possible evidence of rents received and values in the locality concerned, and then assess the property; (2) if the owner is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's decision he appeals to the Taxation and Finance Committee, which consists only of Councillors, and which in due course sits in judgment on his appeal.

"Lastly, I would ask the House to remember this: if he is dissatisfied with the result of his appeal, though in practice he is rarely, he may appeal to the Small Cause Court. There is nothing in this amending Bill to alter this and the appeal will still lie to the Court of Small Causes in the last eventuality. As I said before, I look upon this as the most important point of the Bill.

12
noon.

"The amendments which stand in my name are interdependent, and are designed to cancel the amendments put in by the Select Committee and to restore the provisions of the Bill as originally drafted, with the exception that the Small Cause Court is given its proper name instead of being referred to as the Court of Small Causes as was the case in the original Bill. The effect of these amendments would be that appeals would lie from the Commissioner to the Small Cause Court without the intervention of any Committee of the Council. Now Sir, what is the position in other cities? Have other cities found any difficulty, the other great major cities in the country? Calcutta has been through many troubles and many difficulties in its municipal Government, but this system is in vogue in Calcutta and we have not heard anything against it. In Calcutta the appeal is to the Commissioner and then to the Small Cause Court. There has never been any objection to it. It seems to me very strange that so much should have been made of this point that we should be faced with the Select Committee having altered

[Mr. D. M. Reid]

[3rd February 1936]

this when the Government had considered it most carefully and had considered it right that the appeal should lie to the Small Cause Court. The Select Committee after much argument have invented this new kind of committee which is only an adaptation of the former one. The great point of providing appeals to the Small Cause Court is that this will discourage frivolous appeals. I propose to show later what that means.

“The Appeals Committee proposed by the Select Committee on this Bill will have to face the same problems as in the present system. At present the Standing Committee on Taxation and Finance, sitting as an Appeal Committee, has to face an overwhelming amount of work which it cannot possibly investigate fully. In the year 1933-34, 1611 appeals—so I am advised—against property tax assessments were heard and disposed of by the Standing Committee. In 1934-35, 1217 appeals were so heard and disposed of. As against this, the quantity of arrears awaiting disposal was very great.

“Let us take a particular date. On October 12th, 1935, the total number of property tax appeals lodged since the 1st January of the same year—that is for the first ten months—was 4,415. Four thousand four hundred and fifteen appeals against assessment! Out of this number, the number which had been dealt with by the Commissioner was 1,666. Two thousand seven hundred and forty-nine had not yet been disposed of. Our Commissioner is a man of character and experience. He does his best. But how can he hope to cope with 4,415 appeals in the course of the year? Of these certainly 50 per cent would ultimately come before the Standing Committee. Indeed there was nothing to prevent them from coming before the Standing Committee whatever the Commissioner might say. I ask: why should they not all come before the Standing Committee since it does not cost anything to bring them there?

“The Standing Committee is expected to deal with anything from 60 to 100 appeals in an afternoon. In practice it is a Saturday afternoon, it might be a day like to-day when the entire Committee might wish to be elsewhere. We are all busy men, we are tired after the week's work and I cannot say that the practice in the Corporation will be different later, as long as elected councillors are men who have got their own work to do. They cannot dispose of 4,400 appeals in the course of a year, that is to say over 100 appeals a week allowing for holidays and so on. The position is impossible.

“Now, Sir, is it likely that 4,400 appeals after having been carefully considered by the officers of the Corporation and then by the Commissioner—a fair, right-minded and a proper man—should go on being appealed against further and still have substance in them? Many of them are undoubtedly frivolous and this would certainly be checked by making provision for appeals to lie to the Small Cause Court.

“Furthermore, it is contrary to all principles of the administration of justice for interested parties to hear appeals. Councillors of the Corporation cannot help being interested in some way or other. I

3rd February 1936]

[Mr. D. M. Reid]

myself have sat on that committee and could not help being interested in certain cases that came up, however much I tried to do my duty. Indeed, Sir, with all the highest ideals of justice in our minds, we as councillors were, and present councillors are, friends of the other councillors—indeed the closest friends and acquaintances of the other councillors. Every councillor wishes to do the best he can for his division. Of course that is his job. That is what he is elected for—to do his best for the people of his division. What is he expected to do? He is naturally expected to stand up for the people of his division. Indeed, it is a very difficult position, particularly when he has always to think of his next election in his division or institution. As a member myself of the Chamber of Commerce, I will have in my mind my next election. If I did not stand up for the people of my constituency, they would say that I was not a proper man to represent them. It is not a nice position. I do not dissociate myself in any respect from the other councillors. In fact, I am just in the same position. What would my supporters say if I said, “I am sorry, I have to give my opinion as a judge. I think you ought to be assessed as the Commissioner says.” They would naturally ask, “What is the good of you?” You have been sent to look after us. In such circumstances, what can the councillor do, but give consideration to his electors when they come to ask him to help them in the matter of their assessment? I would say that it is not only divisional councillors who have this serious problem. The institutional councillors receive constant representations from property owners asking for influence to be brought to bear on the members of the Taxation and Finance Committee, quite apart from having representations about the interests of the members of their own institutional bodies. I am not in any way suggesting that any improper or undue influence is sought to be exercised. It is merely that facts are brought forward, and the member is asked to see whether the assessment has been properly made.

“I suppose almost every member of this Council, in municipal or district affairs somewhere in this Presidency, has experienced the constant stream of visitors to his house, pleading for some help in some local matter. My experience, first as an ordinary councillor, then as a member of the Taxation and Finance Committee and finally as Chairman of that Committee, was that I had an increasing number of personal appeals for assistance in reducing assessment on property. Ought we, as ordinary citizens, to be set up in the position of judges? In the circumstances, is it for us to be responsible for the administration of justice—mixing the judicial with the executive—particularly when we have to deal with those who place us in the councils by their votes? Again, let me say that I do not in any way dissociate institutional from divisional councillors. As I said before, it is definitely contrary to all the principles of administration of justice.

“Now let me give my own experience. When I became Chairman of the Taxation and Finance Committee, I determined to try to investigate each case thoroughly. With all the best will in the world, I soon found that it was impossible. A hundred appeals in an afternoon!

[Mr. D. M. Reid]

[3rd February 1936]

The committee would have to sit almost every day throughout the year to deal with arrears properly and to go into all the evidence. It is natural that the only way to do it was to deal with them by some sort of rough rule. I soon grasped what that possible rough rule should be. There was only one—a compromise—a simple way and the only possible way, of doing it. If the Commissioner of the Corporation, after having carefully examined the facts of any particular case and knowing the various previous assessments right through the whole field, finally decided that the proper assessment in a particular case was Rs. 100, and the appellant said that it should be Rs. 50, the only workable method seemed to be for us to say "Very well, Rs. 75." I did that; I hope that no councillor of the Corporation or former councillor will think I am making any attack on them. I am not. I am making an attack on myself as much as on anybody else; but I think it is not an attack at all. It is the only possible way to cope with the tremendous amount of arrears, and to give fair judgment in the circumstances. It is a position in which we ought not to have been placed. But in almost every case, the appellant received our decision with signs of evident gratification.

"In spite of all our efforts, we had great difficulty in preventing other councillors from coming and pleading the cause of each applicant from his division. What else could he do? He was in a very difficult position indeed. He would feel that he was not doing his duty as a councillor if he did not listen to what the applicant had to say, and agree to go and help him to put his position before the Committee. Surely no man should be placed in such an unhappy position. (I must again crave the indulgence of the House for being so long.)

"We now come to the proposed Taxation Appeals Committee, which I will grant the Hon. the Chief Minister, is a sincere attempt to get at a compromise—it is our '75 rupees' again. But I do not think it is right. It is to consist of three members, of whom two are to be members of the Council elected by it, and the third is to be a person appointed by the Local Government either without remuneration or on such remuneration as may be fixed by them, etc. This third is, rightly, to be the Chairman of that Committee. What is the object of instituting this committee? Why do you want it? It was not contained in the original Bill. It was never the intention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to have it in the Bill. Government had no intention of having any such committee. For all the years during which this Bill was considered they were quite definite that the present Appeals Committee was unsatisfactory and that the Calcutta arrangement was the right method. It gave satisfaction all through. There was nothing difficult about it, especially as Madras is a most notable city for fair judgment. Why should not the appeals lie from the Commissioner to the Small Cause Court? That was considered the proper course by the Government all these years, until the Select Committee decided to alter it.

"Now Sir, is it because this is due to distrust of the Commissioner? No; quite frankly, No. We have seen various commissioners and we

3rd February 1936]

[Mr. D. M. Reid]

know how justly they try to do their job and they do it fairly. If it is not distrust of the Commissioner, if he can be trusted to do his job fairly—what else is it? If the Commissioner can be trusted to deal with these appeals fairly and justly, obviously there is no need for a Standing Committee. Is it because the Commissioners will be too strict? No. Perhaps, they have been too kind, most of them, far from being too strict. It may be argued that it is a question of the expense of the Small Cause Court, which the poor people cannot afford to pay. Is not the Commissioner going to help the poor people in the city? Is he not going to listen to reasonable arguments? In whose interest is this standing committee constituted? The people? No doubt, we will hear exactly the same arguments we have heard before; but I cannot say there is much to be said for them.

“There is the argument that going to the Small Cause Court is expensive. In these days of depression a person will be considered to be light-hearted if he goes to Court without a very strong case.” 12-15 p.m.

“The Commissioner will have to do a great deal of work in this connexion, and he will do it justly and rightly; and we cannot think in this House that any man of experience and responsibility is going to say that the Commissioner will not do the work fairly. What will be the position if two councillors are appointed to this Committee? Their position would be of great power; none of them would be expressing an opinion, but would quote the opinion of the other gentleman. We all like being in position and power; we all like to be the one to say ‘aye’ or ‘nay.’ What is the good of it? Are these councillors likely to be specially gifted, over and above the officer to be appointed by the Government? Officers of Government with very long experience in the city may be expected to do this work very carefully and justly. It seems to me that, instead of the power being vested, as it is at present, amongst seven elected members, plus one, the Mayor, in the present committee, it is going to be reduced to two; they will be chosen as two arbiters along with the officer appointed by the Government, and I am afraid that affairs will become far worse than at present. I go further and say, as some of my friends observed, that the position can never be any better. If, at any time, I went back to the Corporation of Madras to represent Trade and Commerce, would I be enamoured of the place, to be elected as one of the members of this committee? I certainly would not. Leave aside the time which that committee is going to take; as regards the time that will be taken, this committee, presumably, or the officer appointed by the Government, will go into these cases very carefully; the other two members will be required to attend very long hours for disposing of so many appeals. How much work is there going to be? There is the certain alternative; those two councillors will not attend those meetings; what is the quorum there? Nothing is laid down in this Bill. The quorum, presumably, would be the officer appointed by the Government sitting alone, and he would still be competent to adjudicate. It would be merely putting another commissioner to do all the work which the first commissioner did. It will be an appeal from commissioner 1 to commissioner 2. Both will

[Mr. D. M. Reid]

[3rd February 1936]

do the work exactly in the same way, and the second commissioner will be called the Chairman of the Taxation Appeals Committee, with an additional burden on the city for the salary of that officer. I do not know what his salary will be; it will be at least Rs. 1,000 a month, or Rs. 12,000 a year, for no purpose other than doing part of the work of the Commissioner over again.

"Sir, I do not want to labour the point; I have much experience of this sort of thing; I am not speaking in the air; it is a thing in which I feel very deeply; I express this idea in the interests of the citizens of this city; I am not saying anything against any man. Every Member of this House has the right here to feel honestly and to express his feeling.

"I should like to pay a tribute to the Hon. the Chief Minister for the work he has done in regard to this Bill, which is now nearing its completion, and to his pertinacity in sitting session after session and pushing it on, determined as he is to see that the City Municipal Act will be so amended, and the city's improvement so advanced, as to be a model for all the cities in the Presidency. I know the Hon. Minister has had many difficulties in discussing the provisions of the Bill with many party members, and of trying to bring them round to his views, I shall be very sorry if this comes to a division and if we have to divide in opposition to the Government. I know what the original idea was, and it has been altered in the Select Committee by people who wanted this kind of provision. I should like to appeal to the Members of the Select Committee—I see very many faces here—there are many old friends of mine who served on the Committee to consider this Bill; they may consider that possibly I may be right, and it would be better not to have this proposed committee. I cannot tell what will happen afterwards. I hope they will see that there is reason in what I say. One of my friends said in the language which next to English, I understand best: 'Ee samacharamu mattladetha, tappaka peddha jugadamu jarugunu.' (If you speak about that, we shall fight a great battle.) This is a simple matter; we can deal with it in a friendly way, and come to the only possible decision. This is not a question of getting at the party in power. I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister to consider this question, if he would not be prepared to allow the House a free vote; this is not going to disrupt the party in power. But it is a thing which is a matter of interest, extremely important to the city citizens, extremely important to trade and commerce. I appeal, Sir, to the Hon. the Chief Minister to allow us a free vote on this question."

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I rise to second the motion so ably moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Reid, representing Europeans in this Council. As he has said in the course of his speech, we have no personal axe to grind in this matter. Nor are we doing it for party purposes. We feel in the interests of the tax-payer and in the interests of the members of the Corporation Council itself, it is better that this question of deciding appeals on taxation should be taken away from

3rd February 1936] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

the Council and should go from the Commissioner straight to the Small Cause Court, because then we will have a judicial tribunal trying the case after the Commissioner comes to a conclusion. The Commissioner may be right or wrong; in many cases he may be right. If the right of appeal is to be given to the tax-payer, I think it ought to be to a court of law and not to the City Corporation or its members. What will happen has been vividly described by Mr. Reid. As he has himself stated, even non-divisional councillors like him who do not belong to any division will not be willing to serve on this committee, because there will be influence brought to bear upon them. Therefore it is evident that, in the interests of the administration of the city, in the interests of the tax-payer, we must get this away from the Corporation and give it to an outside body like the Small Cause Court, which has done this work all these years. I think, as Mr. Reid explained, it will be too much work on the councillors even if they are willing, to serve on this committee. As he himself said, there will be about 4,000 appeals and they will take a comparatively long time. Is it possible for non-officials having their own work to do, to sit on these committees and hear these appeals and come to fair conclusions? I would therefore appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister to whom Mr. Reid paid a well-merited compliment, that he should not consider this as a party question but should consider it from the point of view of the interests of the city and of the tax-payer and not let it go to a committee. Mr. Reid gave further reasons; he said that remuneration has to be paid to the gentleman who is going to be the president of the Taxation Appeals Committee. As he has got to hear appeals from the Commissioner, I believe that his position should carry certain amount of weight and respect among the appellants whose cases he will decide. You will be putting further and additional burden on the Corporation of Madras by getting this special officer. Considering all these circumstances, I earnestly hope that the Hon. the Chief Minister will accept this very reasonable amendment."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, I think I can clarify the situation by a few words at this stage. Hon. Members of this House are, no doubt, aware that in the Bill as introduced by Government, provision was there to do away with the existing taxation appeals to the committee and to provide for appeals to the Small Cause Court. Subsequent to the introduction of the Bill, there has been a great deal of public agitation in the City of Madras against this provision mainly on the ground of delay and expense to which the tax-payer will be put to by having a provision in the Bill to have recourse to a civil court. During the proceedings of the Select Committee, a great deal of attention was paid and paid rightly to this provision. After careful consideration a compromise was arrived at by which it was decided that there should be a committee of three members—more or less a kind of Mayor's Court—with a Chairman, to hear and decide the appeals. I will state that this is the compromise which commanded the largest amount of agreement in the Select Committee and was accepted by the Government as a compromise.

[The Raja of Bobbili]

[3rd February 1936]

12-30
p.m.

"As regards the position of the Government with regard to this amendment now moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Reid, with the object of restoring the provisions in the Bill as originally introduced, I have to state that if there is unanimity in the House that it is preferable to have appeals taken to the Small Cause Court as was originally intended in the draft Bill, I for one will have no objection to accept that position. But if there is to be any divergence of opinion on this point, and if the matter is to be pressed to a division, of course the Government will then have to maintain and support the position as it is in the Select Committee report."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I cannot claim to possess the first-hand knowledge which the hon. Mr. Reid claimed for himself, of being associated with the administration of the Madras Corporation; but I can assure him and other hon. Members of this House that I had been associated with the working of the Local Self-Government department in the districts for over a quarter of a century. Therefore, if I rise to oppose the amendment of Mr. Reid, it is because my experience shows that such a scheme as that propounded by him is impracticable."

"Sir, the reasons which Mr. Reid gave in the course of his speech and which could not have been put and made in a more impressive form than has been done, are mainly four. I have summarized his arguments, and if I am incorrect, I hope he will kindly correct me; and they are these: First, he says that there are too many appeals coming up from the tax-payers, and he has enumerated the figures for the past few years and stated that they have risen to about 4,400 a year. His second argument is that there cannot be found a few councillors or a committee of councillors who have the honesty, the integrity and the leisure, to dispose of all the appeals . . ."

Mr. D. M. REID:—"On a point of explanation, Sir; I did not say anything about the honesty of any person."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"That is the other side of the shield, Sir; I only put it as a plausible argument made by him, viz., that these people would not be independent, could not afford to be independent, because they represent their constituencies. Am I right, Sir, in that? They have to look to the interests of their constituencies; they will be influenced by people, they will be pestered by friends, they won't be given rest; and that was the case during all the time he has had experience of the Corporation. Therefore, I take it that he said that is not possible for them, and the inference is that there would not be found persons who would have the integrity and independence to sit as judges in such matters. . . ."

Mr. D. M. REID:—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir; I did not use the word 'integrity.'"

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, the same word might not have been used; but it is open to me to draw the conclusion from the facts given by him."

3rd February 1936]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

“ Again, Sir, he brought forward a third argument and said that the Small Cause Court as a judicial tribunal would be more independent and capable of disposing of a large number of appeals in proper time, and therefore this intermediary over the Commissioner's judgment was unnecessary. The fourth and the most important of his arguments was that the Commissioner is a very independent person, a person of great honesty and judgment, of experience and knowledge and gifted with all other virtues which would make him a good judge; and that if all these virtues are combined in him, it would be better to trust to his judgment in the matter instead of having an intermediary to revise the judgment of such a capable officer who is very highly paid and who has got onerous duties to discharge. I really pity the poor Commissioner. As it is, to-day the Commissioner's work is reported to be so very heavy that he is finding it impossible for him to attend to the very many duties which are necessarily to be attended to by him. I won't enter now into those other duties of the Commissioner and I won't dilate upon the judicial aspect of the duties of the Commissioner. But taking the arguments one by one, let us see what is being done by these committees. Supposing the committee on taxation, according to his experience, sits and effects a compromise, as it does always, between the Commissioner's decision and the arguments of the appellant, the committee would have to take out the decision of the Commissioner and arrive at some method of compromise and there the matter rests. But what will happen according to the argument of the hon. Member? If the Committee is not to dispose of the matter either by means of a compromise or conciliation or adjustment, the result will be that you will drive all the 4,400 poor people to the Small Cause Court, to file a plaint, an appeal or objection, incur an expense of a large amount, engage a vakil for the case, pay a stamp-duty or seek an exemption from such payment, wait at the Small Cause Court day after day, week after week and month after month, wait on the vakil, wait on the court's convenience to take up the particular case and undergo all these troubles. There will be 4,400 appeals taken to the Small Cause Court. I would ask hon. Members of this House who have experience of the law courts, especially the Small Cause Courts' summary disposals in the mufassal, or who have had experience of sitting in the Small Cause Court in Madras, to imagine the amount of expense, worry and time that is wasted in these courts. I am sure, Sir, that if the hon. Member has had an experience of these Small Cause Courts as he has had experience of the Madras Corporation, he would not recommend that all these poor people should be driven to such courts.

“ As regards his next argument, when a committee is appointed, the committee would review the work of the Commissioner. In most cases where the Commissioner has come to a certain conclusion, it may be that the committee agrees with the Commissioner in the absence of any fresh evidence, and if it does so, that would prevent the people from going to the Small Cause Court. In the mufassal, according to

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[3rd February 1936]

the District Municipalities Act, as soon as fresh taxation is made or a revision of taxation is made, there is a standing committee elected by the Council which sits over appeals. It may be that in a town with a population of 60,000, there will be about 8,000 revision petitions or appeals and the standing committee sits and disposes of all the revision petitions except a very few which will remain for being disposed of by the Council. There is no Small Cause Court business there. People have been carrying on municipal administration in distant places, well and steadily, and there has never been a complaint that because there was no Small Cause Court appeal provided for, the rate-payers were suffering, nor was there any complaint at any time that the committee in order to dispose of these revision petitions, had to spend enormous time or could not find sufficient time to dispose of them. Now, Sir, under the District Municipalities Act, when a tax is imposed, an objection will be raised first before the Chairman and now before the Commissioner; the Commissioner listens to the objection, and if there is an appeal the standing committee will sit and look into the matter and come to a decision. There will be about 4,000 appeals. That is the position, and we have been carrying on like this even in big municipalities like Madura, Trichinopoly, etc., where the population is nearly 100,000, without detriment to the tax-payer or doing him any injustice. This is my experience of the working of the District Municipalities Act, and I cannot conceive how there can be more difficulties as has been so eloquently described by Mr. Reid.

“ Mr. Reid said again that the members of the committee will not be able to give as much time or attention to this matter as necessary, and that therefore there should be no committee at all. But this committee is intended only to decide cases on the basis of the decision of the Commissioner and the arguments advanced by the rate-payers; it is expected to be a sort of tribunal, in order to prevent people from going to a separate tribunal at great expense, viz., the Small Cause Court. After all, the committee is a tribunal of our own people. Now, Sir, I put a fundamental question to my friend: Do you distrust a tribunal of your own people for disposing of such matters? If you have no trust or confidence in them in matters relating to taxation, then by all means abolish all these committees. If you have not got capable men on whom you can rely in such matters, that means to say that the swaraj which we have been claiming, and rightly claiming all along, is not what we are entitled to have. Therefore, Sir, it seems to me that that argument does not hold water.

“ Then again, we have now so many standing committees, special committees, finance committees and all sorts of committees. I suppose all these committees have got certain specified functions which are intended for the welfare and well-being of the rate-payers in the different wards from which the committee members have been elected. Is there any great trouble in finding out people for functioning as members of these special or standing committees? I cannot conceive of such an argument coming from an experienced person like Mr. Reid.

3rd February 1936]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

It passes my understanding to hear that persons elected to these committees will not be able to devote sufficient time and attention to the work of listening to appeals, scrutinizing them and sorting out the reasonable and the unreasonable ones. If they are unreasonable appeals, they can say straightaway that they cannot be allowed; it is only in the case of a few reasonable appeals, that they will have to revise the decision or come to a new decision. This procedure, as I said, will save the people from resorting to the Small Cause Court. After all, Sir, even in the Small Cause Court, there is a single Judge; and how many appeals can a judge dispose of in a day? Hon. Members may imagine how many cases a Small Cause Court Judge can dispose of in a day in addition to the other ordinary work which he has to attend to. Today we have a complaint here that the Small Cause Court Judges are not able to dispose of all the work before them. In addition to their present work, if you have these 4,400 cases dumped on them for being disposed of, how can they do the work? Then, the Small Cause Court will have to be strengthened; an able judge will have to be appointed for the purpose of listening to these appeals from the Corporation. Therefore, Sir, it seems to me that the argument cannot be maintained on any ground that the committee will not be able to do its work effectively in the interests of the administration and in the interests of the rate-payers.

“Then, Sir, it seems to me that in Calcutta there is no Committee of Appeal to deal with such cases; and there the appeal is direct^{12-45 p.m.} from the decisions of the Commissioner to the courts. I would ask hon. Members to see how many judges there are in the Calcutta Small Cause Court and to look at the time it takes for appeals to be disposed of. I wish hon. Members had seen the latest Administration Report of the Calcutta Corporation for 1933-34. I saw it reviewed. There the complaint is that there are a number of cases pending. That shows that the example of the Calcutta Corporation is not a sure and certain guide to us. On the other hand, our experience of the municipalities and our experience of standing committees and finance committees of the Corporation show that it is necessary that there should be some check placed on the decisions of the Corporation with a view to see that the rate-payers do not suffer. The question is whether we should have confidence in our own fellow-taxpayers or in the Small Cause Court. Here, as a matter of executive necessity you find the Commissioner being pressed with so much work. Otherwise, his decision must always be correct. If we have a Committee of the Corporation, in order to revise his decisions, it will certainly save much time and expense for the tax-payers; and I do not think the committee will always agree with the decisions of the Commissioner; nevertheless, there would not be a large percentage of cases where appeals may lie to the Small Cause Court. After all, the number of appeals that are likely to go to the Small Cause Court will be very much minimized and the percentage of appeals against the decision of the committee will certainly be very small. Therefore, a compromise

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[3rd February 1936]

was arrived at in the Select Committee, that between the Commissioner and the Small Cause Court, there should be a committee to scrutinize the various appeals against the decisions of the Commissioner and thereby reduce the pressure of work, reduce the expenditure, reduce the amount of trouble and minimize the time of the tax-payers. On all these grounds, Sir, I do not find myself in agreement with the principle of the amendment."

* Diwan Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am extremely thankful to the Hon. the Chief Minister for having been so firm in retaining this clause in the Bill and thus coming to the rescue of the citizens of Madras. I am also extremely thankful to Sir Patro. Sir, this is a matter of very great importance to the citizens of Madras and I therefore appeal to my hon. Friend, Mr. Reid, who is always reasonable and sincere, to reconsider his decision and withdraw his amendment. Sir, most of the citizens of Madras are very poor and they do not possess any knowledge of the affairs of the Corporation. As a matter of fact, one day, one old man and his old wife came to me and represented to me that the tax on their house was increased. When I advised them to appeal to the Corporation Finance Committee, the old man expressed astonishment saying 'appeal to Government!' 'No, I will be sent to jail.' Then I assured him that no such thing would happen and that he might safely appeal to the Corporation. The wife was a little better than the husband and she told the husband that, 'when so and so assures us that we will not be dealt with by the Government, why not we do that.' So, Sir, in the first place, people do not know whom to appeal to and they also think that when the Corporation or the Government do a certain thing, they should suffer in silence. That is their position. I therefore appeal to Dr. Subbarayan not to press this amendment and see that as a result the citizens of Madras are saved. Moreover, Sir, they are really very poor people. If in a certain case, taxation is increased from Rs. 5 to Rs. 6, the owner of the house should appeal to the Court of Small Causes, he will have to pay some stamp-fees, engage a vakil for the purpose and then wait for a number of days before it could be taken up and disposed of. Besides this, if Mr. Reid's amendment is carried, it will involve the appointment of an additional judge in the Small Cause Court to dispose of such cases. If this amendment is carried, what I would request the Corporation is to appoint a special officer in the Corporation to tell those people whose tax has been increased to prefer an appeal to the court, as otherwise, they are not likely to do that. Not only that, they should have a special vakil appointed by the Corporation to defend such cases. Now, Sir, the Corporation bill collectors are very helpful to the tax-payers in that they tell the people in case their taxation is enhanced, to appeal to the Corporation. If, as I have already stated, Mr. Reid's amendment is accepted, I would request the Corporation and the Commissioner to appoint a special officer to advise the poor people who have no knowledge of the civic administration of the town, to appeal to the

3rd February 1936] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

Small Cause Court and also to appoint a vakil to defend these poor people in the court. I therefore appeal to the hon. Members of the House and those who have the welfare of the poor citizens of Madras at heart to come to their rescue by voting against this amendment. Otherwise it will work a great hardship on them. At present, there are two schools of thought in regard to this matter. One set of people want that the present Appeals Committee should continue; and the other set want that the rate-payers should go to a court of law. But the amendment in the Bill is a *via media* between the two views. Sir, if there was anybody who fought tooth and nail in the Select Committee against appeals going to the Small Cause Court it was myself and my colleagues of the Corporation who were members of the Select Committee. So, Sir, let those gentlemen who support the amendment before the House consider twice before making the poor citizens suffer these hardships as a result of this amendment. I know, Sir, the case of a poor man who died a miserable death on account of the fact that he did not know where to appeal and how to appeal when the tax on his house was enhanced some time back. If only hon. Members who support this amendment go into the streets of Madras, they will come to know the poor state of the people at first hand and their ignorance of things relating to appeals and so on. Now, what is done is, the Revenue Officer sends the bill for increased taxation and people are advised to appeal to the Commissioner. The Commissioner himself goes to the spot on receipt of the appeal or sends some assistant, sees the affected persons and if he thinks any reduction is necessary, he does revise the tax. If he does not consider any reduction necessary, an appeal is sent against his decision to the Standing Committee which consists of Councillors. Even if the appeals are to go to the court, the Commissioner will have the same amount of work as he has now. Why should there be the other extreme of going to the Small Cause Court? I do not see. By all means let them devise any other means except the driving of people to a court of law. What is now proposed in the Bill is a satisfactory *via media*. I am sure most of the Councillors will not like the idea of these poor people being dragged into courts. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar supported, I believe, the present method of appeal to the Taxation and Finance Committee. I thank the Government for having come to the rescue of the poor people by bringing forward this provision. I therefore oppose the amendment."

* Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" Mr. President, Sir, I would not think of speaking on this subject; but the Hon. the Chief Minister has held out a hope of reconsidering the decision of the Select Committee. I do not know whether I would be in a minority in what I am going to say, but it strikes me that it will be taking a retrograde step to invest judicial powers in any committee of the Corporation. The tendency nowadays is to take away all powers except legislative powers from elected bodies. Already executive powers have been taken away from elected bodies, but now it is sought by this amending section to invest a committee with judicial powers. It is proposed that an elected body

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

[3rd February 1936]

should decide appeals from the decision of a non-elected Commissioner. I think it is a wrong step. I do not think people should be afraid of courts. Because there is likely to be some delay in the disposal of appeals by courts, some members of the Council are of the opinion that it is better to have cases disposed of in a quick way by committees than by the law courts which take a little more time. I believe in the United States of America, Judges were elected; I do not know whether they are still being elected. I consider that that kind of procedure is extremely wrong and we cannot possibly think of judges of any courts being elected. We are hedging round the law courts and High Courts with all sorts of powers and privileges, so that they may not in any way be biassed by any indirect influences. Here it is sought to have a Standing Committee which is subject to all sorts of influences and to invest it with powers of appeal against the decision of a non-elected Commissioner. I should like the Commissioner to state what he thinks about it and how he would like his decisions to be appealed against to Standing Committees. I am myself a member of a municipal council, though not of such an august body as the Corporation. At one time it was suggested that I should be appointed a member of the Taxation Committee, and I thankfully rejected the proposal, as I thought it would be difficult for me to carry out the duties. I may say that even as a mere member of the council I was very often approached by electors asking me to intercede with the members of the Taxation Committee and in several such cases where appeals were made, they succeeded though I thought there was no chance of their succeeding. Of course, I do not attribute the members of the Committee any corruption; far from it. But there is such a thing as bias; and could any member of the Corporation or council say that he would be free from bias if approached by members who supported him in his election or gave him his votes.

1 p.m.

“ I was approached once by a very strong supporter of mine who was responsible for my election. I was very glad I was not a member of the Taxation Committee. I must say that it is extremely difficult for a member of the Corporation to be free from bias. Under these circumstances when it is desired that the obligations of elections should be less I should say such power should not be given to the Select Committee. Appointments used to be made in England formerly on the recommendation of the Members of Parliament. Subsequently a large number of Members of Parliament sent a memorial that they should be relieved of these duties for the reason that for every friend that they made they made 99 enemies. In the same way the members of the Corporation should not desire to take up special duties of this sort which could not give them satisfaction. The tendency is to dispose favourably any appeal made for reduction because the member has nothing to lose and the other members have nothing to lose. Members of the Corporation should be free from any duties where bias would prejudice the cause. I think we ought to carefully distinguish legislative work from executive and judicial work. I think in Germany a good deal of the power exercised by the Corporation or the Municipal

3rd February 1936] [Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

Council is exercised by experts. The tendency in India also is to have the experts as Commissioners. There should also be experts to do the judicial part of the work of the Corporation. Otherwise we may as well go back to the old condition. Let the Commissioner be an elected person of the Corporation. Let the Engineer be elected by the Corporation. If you want to have the best possible administration I think it is desirable that judicial work should be entirely done by men who are trained to do judicial work and are experts in it. With regard to the possibility of delay in the civil court I think this is a somewhat exaggerated idea. If it is found that there will be delay then the best possible thing is for the Hon. the Chief Minister to induce his colleagues to have the Act so amended as to expedite the work of the courts. I think in other countries also the appeals go to courts. I have some experience of it and I do not think there has been any delay in the disposal of those cases. Summary procedure might be adopted. Mr. President, Sir, I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will carefully consider this matter. Even if there is sharp divergence of opinion I hope he will reconsider his opinion and see whether it is not possible to accept the amendment which will be in the interest of purity and efficiency of administration and which would prevent the Legislative Council from taking what I call a retrograde step."

* Mrs. K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA spoke in Tamil, and the following is an English summary of her speech:—

"Mr. President, Sir, in speaking on the amendment before the House I wish to bring to its notice the following facts. In my experience I have found that going to court involves heavy expenditure and delay to the litigants. There is no doubt that in preferring appeals to court one has to prepare the points for appeal and file it in the usual course in court which has other things to do and this involves not only delay but also expenditure. As an honorary Bench Magistrate I have found in my experience that even for disposing of nuisance cases the presiding magistrate has to examine witnesses and this procedure often involves delay. As it is usual with the Government to appoint magistrates when the cases filed in bench courts are heavy, so also the Government will be called upon to appoint special judge for disposing of appeal cases. So in order to avoid such contingency it is better even now to allow the provision made in the Bill to remain as it is.

"Moreover, it will be easy for the appellants to go before the Taxation Appeals Committee. In this connexion I may be permitted to point out that many houses in this city are owned by women and as such if appeals are to be preferred in courts it would amount to putting such women to a great hardship. I admit that the Commissioner of the Corporation has got to do a lot of executive work. But in the interests of the women owners I would appeal to him not to mind this work. If the Appeals Committee members were to take some more trouble for the public cause and hold monthly meetings, more cases could be disposed of. Generally, if people are asked to go to court, they will .

[Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma] [3rd February 1936]

not only lose time and money but their profession would be spoiled. If men are put to such difficulties, more so would be the case with women.

“ In conclusion I would urge that the provision may stand as it is.”

Rao Bahadur P. C. MUTHU CHETTIYAR, spoke in Tamil and the following is an English summary of his speech:—“ As it is it looks as if the Commissioner may also appeal to the court. It must be made specific that the Commissioner has no power. Generally both educational and judicial qualifications are not combined in the councillors and such people are made to sit as judges. Such people are likely to be influenced by other considerations whereas men with judicial training cannot. In the second appeal in the High Court 99 per cent do not survive.

“ Two previous decisions will probably cause some prejudice when the matter comes up on appeal to the Small Cause Court. Some expenditure will have to be incurred by going to the court. Vakil fees of course have to be borne by the party. But the stamp duty should be dispensed with. My hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan who spoke on this amendment will realize, if he actually works in a committee of that kind, how party feeling will predominate in determining questions coming before the committee. Apart from it, there is the caste or communal feeling. Some people want to have a place in the committee simply for the sake of communal representation, no matter whether a man is qualified or educated enough to sit in judgment on such matters. It is not as if I am opposed to the amendment of Mr. Reid. I only say that I have great faith in judicial proceedings. Therefore in the public interests and on public grounds, I have to oppose the amendment. When Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar spoke, he gave me the impression that he has not lost faith in the Small Cause Court.”

Diwan Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—“ On a personal explanation, Sir. I never have any sympathy for the increase of taxation being decided by a court of law.”

Rao Bahadur P. C. MUTHU CHETTIYAR speaking in Tamil, said:—“ Whatever that be, I think it would be safer to leave matters as they are, so that people may have the satisfaction of having received the decision of a judicial tribunal.”

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—“ Sir, the question is whether there should be an intermediary body between the Small Cause Court and the Commissioner. An appeal to the Small Cause Court is provided for, and there is no difficulty about that. The arguments so far advanced against such an intermediary body being created appear to be that the members of such a body would be influenced by the appellants or others and that the former would not do justice in the matter. That is to say, their decisions will invariably go against the interests of the Corporation. Practically it comes to this. If anybody influences that body, it would mean they will be influenced against the interests of the Corporation. Assuming that the assessment made by

3rd February 1936] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

the Commissioner is correct, a deduction would be made on account of the undue influence brought to bear upon the standing committee. The other alternative is that appeals should invariably go only to the Small Cause Court. That would mean that a number of appeals will be practically shut out. Of course, the difficulties in this case have been pointed out by several hon. Members. Supposing a man appeals against the assessment, to the extent of only Rs. 2 or Rs. 3 or anything less than Rs. 10, then practically, he would not carry the matter to the Small Cause Court because the expenditure involved will be very much higher than the relief he can get. Thus, you have to choose between the two alternatives. The first is, should we say that all appeals should go to the Small Cause Court and thereby shut out a number of appeals from very poor people? I think that would be a very harsh thing and unless we are compelled to do so, nobody would agree to such a course being adopted. Therefore, you have to examine the other alternative, viz., whether much harm would be done in creating an intermediary appellate body. Here some Members assume in the first instance that the members who constitute that standing committee will generally be weak and will be influenced by others. That is the first objection. My hon. Friend Sir Patro has replied to that and clearly stated that if we cannot carry on the administration of the Corporation in this respect, it would mean that we are not fit for swaraj. That is the reply he has given. Supposing of course that some reduction is made, will it harm the Corporation to a very large extent? The question is which of the two evils is the lesser one. Should you shut out all these poor people from preferring an appeal practically against the assessment of the Commissioner by providing for an appeal only to the Small Cause Court? If you do it, I feel that a number of appeals will be shut out. Well, that is an evil. The other evil is that the Corporation will suffer if the standing committee is unduly influenced by the appellants or others. These are the two evils. Which is the lesser of the two? I think the lesser of the two is the creation of an intermediary appellate body. No doubt, the Corporation may suffer to some extent. But I do not think anybody can assert that the Corporation will necessarily or invariably suffer if the intermediary committee will work as an appellate body. All people may not be strong or fair-minded and some may allow themselves to be influenced. In that case, would you be justified in providing appeals only to the Small Cause Court and thereby preventing a number of appeals being preferred to the committee even in deserving cases? I think the provision made by the Select Committee is a happy compromise of the two situations. The standing committee there provided should consist of somebody to be nominated by the Government either on payment or otherwise and also two members to be elected by the Corporation itself. In such a case, it is a happy combination. If you want a judicial or official element, you have it there. I think it is also possible to select two persons who could be independent and fair-minded enough to do justice between the rate-payer and the Corporation. Therefore, I think the provision already made is quite right,

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [3rd February 1936]

unless as my hon. Friend Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar suggested for the very poor people vakils are engaged and the stamp duty also is paid for by the Corporation. Of course, he did not mean that the Corporation should provide all that. Or rather, the proposition is so absurd that unless all that is done it cannot be workable in practice. So, the amendment ought to be opposed."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The House will adjourn for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m."

(After Lunch—2-30 p.m.)

* Mr. D. M. REID:—"Mr. President, Sir, in view of the conference which we have had during the lunch hour, I do not think it is necessary for me to make any further remarks. It seems clear that if put to a division, my amendment unfortunately is not likely to be carried. I have heard no arguments put forward to refute my contention; I feel just as strongly as ever I did, that the views I put forward are the right views. But though many Members are personally in sympathy with my aims, for various reasons I realize that my amendment cannot be carried, and I beg leave to withdraw it."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name:—

'At the end of rule 14, the following paragraph shall be added, namely:—

"The Taxation Appeals Committee shall have all the powers of a standing committee under sub-section (1) of section 26, and the provisions of sub-section (2) of that section shall apply to requisitions made by the Taxation Appeals Committee as if it were a standing committee."

Sir, it is only a formal amendment and is intended to make the wording clearer."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 220 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 5.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We shall now go back to clause 5."

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clauses 221 to 225.

Clauses 221 to 225 were put and carried.

Clause 226.

Proposed rule 26.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to move—

'In sub-rule (1), for the words and brackets "(if application is made within twelve months from the date of sale; if no such

3rd February 1936] [Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu]

application is made the surplus shall be forfeited to the Corporation)", the following words shall be substituted, namely, " , if application is made by such person within twelve months from the date of the sale. If no such application is made, the property or sum so remaining shall be forfeited to the Corporation."

Sir, this is intended only to make the amendment much better than what it is."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Proposed rule 27.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—" I beg to move—

(1) *In sub-rule (a), for the words " with reference to the value of the sum distrained for," the following words shall be substituted, namely, " with reference to the amount due for which the distraint is made."*

(2) *In sub-rule (b), after the words " Such fees " the word " shall " shall be inserted."*

Sir, this amendment is intended to make the language clearer than what it is now."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 226 as amended and clauses 227 to 231 were put and carried.

Clause 232.

Rule 4 of Schedule V.

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name, that is—

'Add the following as item (t):—

" (t) *the provision for old age pension, sickness and unemployment insurance and relief."*

I know that at the present moment the funds at the disposal of the Corporation may not be sufficient to launch upon schemes of this sort. But inasmuch as we have amendments to this very big Act not coming at short intervals, I venture to suggest the inclusion of an item of expenditure of this sort, so that either in the near or distant future when the Corporation has sufficient funds they may, without any further sanction from the Government or the sanction of this House, incur the expenditure on these laudable items. With these words I beg to move the amendment, and also beg to request to kindly accept this very modest amendment. I do not move the other amendments in the hope that in this final appeal on this last amendment I will not be disappointed by the Hon. the Chief Minister."

[3rd February 1936]

2-45
p.m.

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend. The House will notice, Sir, that the provision of old age pension, sickness and unemployment insurance and relief will not be inconsistent with the objects enumerated in the rule 4 of the Schedule. Sir, under item (p) there is already provision for the maintenance of work-houses, infirmaries and so on, and under items (q), (r) and (s) the Corporation is authorized to spend moneys on the organization and maintenance of health associations, child-welfare centres, rescue homes and so on. If it is the duty of the Corporation to provide money for child-welfare and maternity, and the like purposes it ought to be its duty also to provide money for people who are very old, and sick or unemployed. If a provision is made for people who are incapacitated, on account of old age, sickness, etc., it will go a long way to the relief of the suffering masses. If this item (t) is added, it will enable the Corporation to extend relief in the name of humanity to people who are incapacitated in several ways such as old age, sickness, etc."

* Khan Bahadur JAVAD HUSSAIN KHAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, the object underlying this amendment is no doubt a very laudable one. But, as the Mover himself said, all that is required is money. I wish he had also suggested some way of finding money for providing these things. On the whole, Sir, I think it is not the business of the Corporation to undertake this sort of work. I therefore beg to oppose it."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, before I withdraw my amendment I desire to say a few words. I do not want to have the sentimental satisfaction of having pressed my amendment to vote. I would on this occasion make a fresh appeal to the Hon. Minister for Local Self-Government and also other Members on the Treasury Bench to come forward with some amendment which will enable the grant of relief to the poor and helpless people."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Clauses 232, 233 and 234 were put and carried.

Clause 235.

Rule 12 of Schedule V.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I move, Sir, that clause 235 be omitted. This is a new clause introduced by the Government, in my opinion, without any justification, or without any case having been made out at any time against the Corporation for the introduction of the same. This is what the clause reads:

'If the Council shall have given previous authority in writing, such bank may at once pay out of the municipal fund without such order or cheque any expense which the Local Government have incurred on behalf of the Corporation.'

"Sir, this contemplates that the Council should be given power to authorize the Government to draw from the Corporation funds at any time they please. The Government want that the Corporation should by a general resolution enable the Government to draw any

3rd February 1936] [Mr. Basheed Ahmed Sayeed]

moneys which they claim to be due to them without any consent of the Corporation. I consider that this is a very novel procedure and it cuts at the root of all autonomy of the Local Self-Governing institutions. It is in direct conflict with the autonomy that is supposed to be the basis of Local Self-Government. I think, Sir, that the Government ought to have adduced stronger grounds—in fact there is no ground at all—for asking for such a power. They have not been able to put forward a single case—and I do not think they will be able to put forward a single case to-day—to say that the Corporation has refused to pay any money legitimately due to the Government. If the Government think that there are legitimate items of expenditure for which money is due to them by the Corporation and that the Corporation has refused the same, let them say so. There has never been such a case. I therefore think that this clause is quite uncalled for and unwarranted. There seems to be no necessity for it nor has there been any occasion in the history of the Corporation for the last twenty or thirty years justifying the Government coming forward with an amendment like this that if the Corporation had given previous authority in writing or passed any resolution, the Government should be entitled to draw any moneys which they think is due to them. I do not think they should have this power. The Corporation has never refused any amount due to the Government. After all, the Corporation is run by the Executive Officer who is the Government's nominee and any amount payable to the Government by the Corporation, the Government are entitled to get. Why should they not get it in the usual manner? Why should they stand on a different footing from any other creditor of the Corporation? There are other people who pay funds into the Corporation and there are rules which govern the refund of those claims. Even if the Corporation is going to be a self-governing autonomous body and if the Government is going to be a creditor in any manner whatsoever, it is open to the Government to adopt the usual procedure of notifying the Corporation that such and such an amount has become due and then claim it as and when the Corporation sees its way to pay it back. I do not see why the Government should have this extraordinary power of drawing from the bank and that without the knowledge and consent of the Corporation simply because the Corporation might have given them some power in writing that they might so draw. This is an arbitrary power which the Government want to assume for itself without any just ground or reason for it. I therefore strongly urge that this clause should be omitted."

The amendment was duly seconded.

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, the Hon. Mover has by this amendment raised the same point which was discussed in the Select Committee. After a careful consideration that body decided to retain the original provision. I am afraid my hon. Friend has completely misunderstood the scope and purpose of this amendment. It merely says that to facilitate work and save time the Corporation can authorize any bank where the Corporation funds are maintained to.

[The Raja of Bobbili] [3rd February 1936]

pay to the Government, without any cheque or special order any sums due to the Government for work done on behalf of the Corporation. This is only an arrangement to facilitate business and does not in the least take away the powers of the Corporation. I therefore find that I cannot accept this amendment. I must oppose it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Sir, when my hon. Friend moved this amendment and spoke on it, I did not feel that the Government were taking away any power which the Corporation possessed. I do not agree with him when he said that the Government were taking away the power of the Corporation. But I feel that the point that it must be the endeavour of Government to give the city Corporation the dignity which is due to it, must be borne in mind. I can understand this provision being there in the case of a public body of whose finances the Government are not sure and also they are not certain that such finances will be properly expended. But in the case of a body like the city Corporation which has got as much as 64 lakhs of revenue, and which has got well constituted Council and an efficient executive presided over by a highly placed officer a nominee of the Government itself—it seems to be rather *infra dig* to be called upon to give a blank cheque as it were to the Government to enable it to draw money from the bank direct. I appeal to the Government to bestow some consideration to this aspect of the matter once again. I certainly feel that it is rather *infra dig* for the Corporation to be placed in such a position where the Government can take away the Corporation money without even the knowledge of the Corporation. I do not agree with my hon. Friend the Mover when he said that this tends to take away the power of the Corporation. But certainly it is *infra dig* for the Corporation not to be consulted from time to time when its money is being taken away. On that aspect of the matter I lay emphasis and in that sense I appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister not to place the Corporation in that low level in which it would be placed if this clause is not omitted."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, I am really surprised at the arguments advanced by my hon. Friend, Mr. Hameed Khan. All that this clause says is that power may be given to the Corporation Council to authorize any bank by order in writing that such and such money should be paid to the Government for any work done by them without the issue of any special cheques. I fail to see how this is going to affect the dignity of the Corporation or deprive it of any of its powers. I am really unable to understand why there should be any objection to a provision of this kind. In no way is the Corporation deprived of its powers and the Government are not arming themselves with any authority to draw Corporation moneys.

p.m. "It is simply to give power to the Corporation, if they so desire, to give instructions to the bank to make payments from time to time without separate cheques to Government. It is only in the interests of the Corporation to facilitate their business that the Government have

3rd February 1936] [The Raja of Bobbili]

made this provision in the Bill. In no other way the Government under the guise of this provision will have any authority to take over the money of the Corporation."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I am sorry I am not convinced with the answer given by the Hon. Minister though the hon. Member for the City of Madras said that it was *infra dig* that the Select Committee should have introduced such a provision as this. There is no need at all for the Corporation to give previous authority in writing to the Government that whenever they thought they were entitled to draw some money they should do so. If the Government has done some work for the Corporation it is but reasonable and necessary that the Corporation should know on what account the Government have incurred any expenditure before money is paid out by the bank. It may be that the procedure, so far as I am able to understand, under this new clause seems to be that there should be a general authorization by the Corporation in favour of the Government to draw funds. The Government may or may not draw, but if it comes to the conclusion that they must draw a certain amount of money, is not the Corporation entitled to know whether the demand is legitimate or fair or reasonable?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"That is not at all the intention."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"That is what I understand. There is no provision in the Bill which gives the power to the Corporation to find out whether the claim made by the Government is well founded. In the absence of such a provision what is the business that will be facilitated by having such a provision as this? What is it that is not being facilitated without such a provision as now proposed to be introduced? In how many cases the Government were stuck up on account of non-payment by the Corporation? What is the item of expenditure which the Government have incurred and which the Corporation have refused to pay? No such instances have been given and no just cause has been shown for the retention of such a provision. So I would urge upon the House to consider the question upon these issues."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I do not know if the Hon. Member has misunderstood or wants to mislead the House. It is not a question of Government drawing away the Corporation's money whenever it pleases. It is only a question of the Corporation authorizing the bank to draw the money. Power is given to the Corporation to examine the question and decide whenever any money is sought to be drawn. There is no question of a blank cheque being given at all to the Government. Corporation is the authority to give permission to the bank to allow the money to be drawn. I know such a system prevails in some of the Commercial houses. There is no question of giving a blank cheque to the Government and whenever it pleases them they can draw the money. There is absolutely no meaning in that remark. For my part I am unable to appreciate the other point made by the

[The Raja of Bobbili] [3rd February 1936]

hon. Member for the City of Madras that it is derogatory to the prestige of the Corporation if we have such a procedure. If the Corporation wants to adopt that procedure they may do it or they may not do it. Under this provision the Government will have no authority to do it against the wishes of the Corporation."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clauses 235 to 238 were put and carried.

Clause 239.

Schedule VI.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

'The figures and brackets "(1)," "(2)," "(3)," "(4)," "(5)," "(6)" and "(7)" appearing against the items in this schedule shall be omitted.'

Sir, this is only a drafting amendment."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 239 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 240.

Schedule VII.

* Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

'For the word "obey," whenever it occurs, substitute the words "comply with".'

Sir, I think 'obey' is a strong word to be used with reference to a citizen. In a later item the words 'comply with' are used. I thought that the ancient word 'obey' might be substituted by the words 'comply with.' A student obeys his master, children obey their parents but a citizen need not obey the Commissioner. Therefore I move that the words 'comply with' be substituted for the word 'obey' wherever it occurs."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 240 as amended and clause 241 were put and carried.

3rd February 1936]

Schedule.

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

'In the item relating to section 42, after the existing entries in columns (3) and (4), the following entries shall be added, namely:—

For the words

Substitute the words

(3)

(4)

*"to his satisfaction to their satisfaction
to his satisfaction to their satisfaction".*

This is the last of the amendments moved by me and it is only a consequential amendment because the words 'the Local Government' have been substituted for the words 'Governor-in-Council'."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I second this amendment. I want to express my pleasure in seconding the last word of the last amendment."

The amendment was put and carried.

Preamble.

The Preamble was put and carried.

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I beg to move—

'that the further consideration of the Bill may be postponed to a later date'."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

IV.—A BILL FOR THE IMPOSITION AND LEVY OF LICENCE FEES ON THE SALE OF TOBACCO IN THE PRESIDENCY OF MADRAS (BILL No. 17 OF 1935).

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—"I do not propose to move the motion standing in my name to-day but will do so at a future date."

V.—MOTION RE AMENDMENT TO SUB-RULE (1) OF RULE 51 OF SCHEDULE IV OF THE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I beg to move—

'that the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Governor acting with Ministers under sub-section (1) of section 305 of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920

* The Hon. Sir Charles Souter, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., will present the report of the Select Committee on the Bill for the imposition and levy of licence fees on the sale of tobacco in the Presidency of Madras (Bill No. 17 of 1935) and move that the Bill as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration.

[The Raja of Bobbili] [3rd February 1936]

(*Madras Act V of 1920*) to amend the second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 51 of Schedule IV to the said Act be approved:—

Draft rule.

In the second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 51 of the said schedule for the words "fees realizable" the words "fees realized in the preceding school year" shall be substituted.'

Sir, there have been a number of Government Orders issued in connexion with fee concession that it should not exceed 10 per cent of the fee realizable. Some local boards have been permitted to fix various percentages in fee concessions granted to students in schools. As the rule is now worded the fee concession will have to be below the fees realizable during the current year.

3-15 p.m. "Difficulty has arisen in estimating the exact amount of fees that will be realized during the school year as the strength of the school and the amount of fee income realized may vary from month to month. It has therefore been considered desirable that in fixing the percentage of concessions, the fee income realized during the preceding year may be taken into consideration. It is proposed to make the necessary change on the recommendation of the Director of Public Instruction."

The motion was duly seconded.

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise on this occasion not to oppose the rule which the Hon. the Chief Minister wishes to make. But I want to point out that in certain unhealthy localities it so happens that students do not attend school throughout the year. The schools are closed for a certain part of the year, for instance, when an epidemic is raging in the locality or when certain dangerous infectious diseases are spreading in the locality. In such cases if the calculations are made on the actual fee income in the school during such years, it will work a great hardship. I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to bear this in mind and make suitable provision for it in the shape of exceptions to the general rule."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I will have the hon. Member's suggestion examined later on."

The motion was put and carried.

VI.—MOTION *re* INVESTMENT AND UTILIZATION OF THE FAMINE RELIEF FUND.

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'That this Council recommends to the Governor-in-Council that the amount to the credit of the Famine Relief Fund of this Presidency be invested in Government of India securities,

3rd February 1936] [Mr. G. T. H. Bracken]

that a Bill be brought before this Council for constituting the securities into a fund to be used only in times of serious famine or flood, and that the Government of India be moved to address His Majesty's Secretary of State for India to make the necessary amendments to the Devolution Rules.'

Sir, I do not think there is a great deal to be said about this matter. The usefulness of the Famine Relief Fund has been proved often in the past. It is an emergency fund, available at short notice to meet cases of famine and failure of rains. The usefulness of this fund was proved only last year in the famine in Bellary and Anantapur. The minimum amount of the fund has been fixed by the Secretary of State at Rs. 40 lakhs. Owing to accumulations the sum rose to about Rs. 60 lakhs. But owing to the recent famine it is now down again to about Rs. 44 lakhs. As I have said this fund has proved its usefulness in the past and the amount is not excessive as the expenditure on one famine, I think it was in Ganjam, was in the neighbourhood of Rs. 39 lakhs. This fund or some similar fund will be even more necessary in future. At present in an emergency, provinces can fall back on the Government of India, but in future that will not be possible. Each province will have to stand on its own legs and finance its own ways and means. I think an emergency fund of this kind will be of great assistance to the new Government as a nest egg to meet sudden emergencies from. No one can tell when the rains will fail and famine result and for the benefit of the unfortunate people who suffer from failure of rains and famine conditions, it is most advisable that Government should have liquid resources at their disposal to meet famine conditions. Of course any Bill passed by this House will not tie the hands of the future Government; they can repeal or alter it as they think fit, but I hope and believe that the new Government will see the necessity for this emergency liquid fund available for famine just as much as the present Government has found the necessity.

"It is important, of course, that this fund should be a liquid fund in easily realizable securities. Otherwise it would not serve the purpose in view and it is for that reason that investment in Government securities is proposed. The securities could be easily realized and in case of sudden emergency an advance could be obtained on it from any bank or possibly from the Reserve Bank."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"I second it. I think the House will agree to the course proposed by the Hon. Finance Member to take the amount to the credit of the famine fund from the Government of India and invest it in Government securities. The Government of India, I presume, are paying little interest on the amount . . ."

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"The amount at present bears a rate of interest 1 per cent lower than the amount at which we borrow from the Government of India. The fund is bearing an interest of $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent."

[3rd February 1936]

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—" I thank the Hon. the Finance Member. I do not see why we should lose 1 per cent interest. The policy of the Government of India has always been to have our money with them to their advantage. But if we want to liquidate the loans taken from them at a higher rate of interest by raising loans at lower rate of interest they would not agree to it. The proposal of the Government is to take back the sum to the credit of the famine fund from the Government of India and invest it in Government securities which we can easily convert in times of necessity or urgency. It is a very wise and prudent step and I am sure the House will be at one with the Hon. the Finance Member in the course he has proposed to adopt. It is indeed very creditable of the Government to have come forward with this proposal."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I have just given notice of an amendment to the following effect:—

' In line 6, between the word " flood " and the words " and that the Government of India " insert the words " or to construct irrigation works as a protection against famine " . '

" With your permission Mr. President, I would say a few words.

" Sir, even to-day I believe the famine relief fund can be utilized on the construction of small irrigation works which are intended to be a protection against famine. Not merely repairs but even construction of new irrigation works also can be financed from this fund. Perhaps the Government will have to get the sanction of the Government of India for this. Anyhow, I think it is absolutely necessary that a provision to that effect should be there if it is not there at present. I hope the Government will agree to my amendment which seeks to include the construction of protective irrigation works also as one of the items on which the money from the famine relief fund can be spent. For the rest I am glad that the Government have come forward with the proposal to take away the fund from the Government of India and invest it in Government securities which will fetch a higher rate of interest than what the Government of India are now giving.

" Mr. President, this is the small amendment that I wanted to move and I move it."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" But no hon. Member is willing to second the amendment."

* Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Mr. President, I beg to second the amendment. I have the peculiar privilege of coming from one of the most wretched districts which is always suffering from famine. Therefore, with your permission, I should like to say a few words on the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Koti Reddi. I think it would be very useful if the fund could be occasionally utilized for finding water in times of drought. What I have got in mind just now

3rd February 1936].[Mr. M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar]

is this. I do not know whether the Hon. the Finance Member remembers this or not. Fifteen or sixteen years ago there was serious famine in Bellary and there was great alarm in the penal settlement known as the Alipore Jail, for there were over 6,000 convicts then but there was hardly any water for them to drink.

"The Hon. the Revenue Member, who was in charge of famine, came 3-30 there, visited the place and said that water is absolutely necessary not P.m. only for the 6,000 convicts in that locality but also for those living in the surrounding parts. He sanctioned Rs. 3 lakhs in order to construct wells in the tank of Alipore. It was because of that action, incidentally relief was given to the Bellary town itself by having a protected water-supply scheme. It was asked: When a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs is being spent for this purpose, why not give Rs. 16 lakhs for the citizens of Bellary to speed up the protected water-supply scheme. That was the reason why we have a protected water-supply scheme which will not necessitate sinking of wells now. In places other than Bellary town, I think it will be necessary to find water for drinking and other purposes. I therefore think that it is very desirable that some such amendment should be added. I do not know how to put it; I do not quite approve the words of the amendment. I leave it to the Hon. the Finance Member to suggest the necessary alteration. My idea underlying the suggestion is that the amount may also be utilized for the purpose of supplying water to the distressed people in famine areas."

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am not quite clear as to what the mover of the amendment meant, whether the accretions to the famine fund should be used for protective works or whether the corpus of the fund should be used for protective works. If he meant the whole corpus to be used for protective works, that will mean tying it up and the money will not be readily available at the moment required, and that I think would be very undesirable. On the other hand I think there is some point in allowing the accretions to the fund to be used for the purpose the hon. Member has in view. What I mean is we should keep at least Rs. 40 lakhs as liquid reserve for any occasion and the interest on it can be utilized for the purpose the mover of the amendment has in view. I will be quite prepared to recommend to the Government of India that that be permitted. If this resolution is accepted by this hon. House, a Bill will be introduced carrying out the purposes and any details can be put into this Bill. I would therefore suggest to the hon. Mover of this amendment that he may withdraw it on the undersanding that arrangements will be made to allow the accretions to the fund to be used for the purpose he has in view."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I beg leave to withdraw my amendment, as the assurance of the Hon. Member will serve the purpose I have in view."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The main motion was put and carried.

[3rd February 1936]

VII.—REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the motion that stands in my name—

‘ That the Report^a of the Public Accounts Committee on the Appropriation Accounts of this Province for 1933–34 and the Audit Report for 1935 issued by the Accountant-General, Madras, be taken into consideration ’.”

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—“ I second it.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I shall put the main motion first and go on with the amendments as we do with regard to Bills.”

The main motion was put and carried.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Amendments will now be taken up for consideration.”

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name :—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ and on such consideration, this Council is of opinion—

that steps should be taken to recover from the officers concerned, the losses incurred in public funds by their negligence between 1918 and 1933 and their failure to claim concessions allowed by the Railways from July 1918, for Police force allotted on duty in connexion with the tours of His Excellency the Governor-General and His Excellency the Governor ”.”

I was struck rather much beyond the ordinary way when I went through the report and found some astounding statement of facts made therein. That discloses the way in which the administration of our Province was carried on. It is a most notable feature. At page 25 of the report it is stated in connexion with Grant XIV—Police :—

‘ The concession of free-duty passes for police force regularly employed on railway duty and passes for additional police, whether of the railway or district force, specially posted to railways on the occasion of journeys of the Viceroy or the Governor of a Province suggested by the Railway Board in 1918 was not availed of till September 1932’

“ This is the sort of irresponsible way in which there has been waste of public funds. Concession had been allowed to us from 1918 onwards—from July 1918—but for full 14 years public funds were being wasted without the least sense of responsibility. I have absolutely no grievance against any individual in particular; I absolutely know nothing as to who was in charge of the administration or of the papers either in the Secretariat or in the Cabinet. Therefore my remarks are absolutely impersonal and are based only on principles and not meant to convey censure of any particular individual. I am only adverting to the way in which they carry on their business when they are dealing with public funds in such a reckless fashion. The Public Accounts Committee

3rd February 1936]. [Mr. G. Rameswara Rao]

consider the result as most regrettable but agree that no action is now possible in the matter. I cannot understand how it is not possible to find out and recover the amounts due to the Government from those who were in charge of the administration and who were responsible for the maladministration of our public funds. It is one thing to say that we cannot trace them but it is another thing to honestly make the attempt and find out who were actually in charge of affairs, how far they must be deemed liable and whether such honest attempts were made by the executive who are responsible at present for this recommendation to write off, with mere words of regret. I hope the Hon. the Finance Member would take us into confidence and tell us what attempts he has made, irrespective of the persons who are living or dead and gone. The country has suffered such a serious loss which I say, may amount to some lakhs if not a crore; I have no idea of the details of the figures. The Finance Department has not given the wastage incurred by this kind of maladministration; they only say, as if nothing has happened, 'it is regrettable and that no action is possible in the matter.' My submission in this connexion is that the Indian Civil Service Officer is usually considered very efficient and cannot be guilty of any wrong. This lapse may be an exception to the rule of the extreme efficiency he is capable of. But when such a lapse comes to be found out, it is certainly unpardonable for anybody to say that the people from whom the loss can be recouped, ought to be allowed to go scot-free, and that no portion of the public waste for which they have been responsible on account of what is called their neglect or recklessness should be collected. It is one thing when it concerns one's own individual affairs; it is certainly another thing when it concerns a public trust reposed in one by the people and by the Government. When they are dealing with trust-funds they ought to look into the matter much more carefully with *exacta diligentia*. When they administer their own private funds, they can afford to be careless, and it does not concern others. If they fall below the level, very severe action should be taken against this class of officials with whom we are concerned now; they cannot claim any indulgence either of this House or of the superior officers by merely saying that this only a matter of neglect. It is with that idea that I now suggest to the Government that the persons who are responsible for this maladministration ought to be brought to book. Attempts must be made as far as possible to bring them to book. It may be that some of them are not in service now; yet they are drawing their pension; some of them at least are still living; they must be dealt with in a vicarious way. Some of them may be living and they may be asked to pay the amount, for their default in not properly discharging their duties. I hope the Hon. the Finance Member will give us the names of the gentlemen concerned in this matter and would satisfy us that every possible attempt was made to recover the amount from them. My contention is and my appeal to this House is that they must support this amendment and say that as rigorous measures as possible should be taken in this matter. Sir, I would like to know whether I should move my amendments one by one or all together."

[3rd February 1936]

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may move all the amendments that are in his name and later on we can go to other amendments."

MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"You said Sir, that the procedure to be followed will be as in the case of Bills. Amendment after amendment may be moved separately, I suggest, Sir, and voted on."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have absolutely no objection to go on, amendment after amendment; but the difficulty is each of the amendments may be discussed for days together and perhaps we may not be able to finish them. The idea is not to have any voting, unless there is definite agreement from all sides of the House to the contrary. If the hon. Members insist that the amendments should be voted upon separately, I have absolutely no objection."

MR. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I wish to know whether I am to move all the amendments now; it is better if each of them is voted upon separately; I appeal to the Hon. the Leader of the House."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member's idea apparently is that each amendment should be discussed and voted upon separately."

MR. G. R. PREMAYYA seconded Mr. Rameswara Rao's motion.

3-45
P.m.

* MR. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"Mr. President, Sir, as has been pointed out by the hon. the Mover of the motion, there is some information lacking in the explanatory note with regard to this subject, and I should like to have it too. The claim of this concession dates back to the year 1918 and it would come to a considerably big amount if it is calculated up to the year 1933, when I think the authorities of the concerned department took notice of it. The information furnished to us also reveals that certain records connected with this matter are not to be found in the file. At page 69 of the report it is stated:

'The original of the Government Order in which that letter was recorded is missing in the records. It is not therefore possible to find out why it was thought unnecessary to communicate to him the rest of that letter.'

"The note does not give sufficient information about the investigations made with regard to the missing record and the steps taken in the matter. That is the reason, Sir, why I have given a similar motion. I have nothing more to add to what the hon. Mover of the amendment has already stated, and I hope that the Government will see that this matter is investigated and that the loss that has been sustained by the Government is recovered from the concerned individuals, if there is sufficient justification for doing so."

* The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—"I have to begin, Mr. President, by stating that the responsibility, if any, on the part of this Government cannot date back to the year 1918 for this reason: that the copy of the communication from the Railway Board to the Agents was received by this Government at its request only in

3rd February 1936] [Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam]

the year 1921. Almost by an accident as it were, this Government became aware of the existence of the communication from the Railway Board to the agents regarding certain settlements about financial matters between the Government and the railways. On this Government making a request to the Government of India to be supplied with a copy of that communication, it was sent to us in May 1921. Therefore, the responsibility, if any, arising so far as this Government are concerned, could date back only to the year 1921. On receipt of that communication in which there was a reference to police buildings within railway premises, that portion alone appears to have been communicated to the Inspector-General who took action thereon.

“Next, as regards the question of loss which the hon. the Mover of the motion insisted on being recovered from the officers responsible, I am not able to convince myself, Sir, if it can strictly be termed a ‘loss.’ As the letter of the Railway Board to the Agents of the Railways itself says it was only a concession to be granted by the railways to the Local Governments with reference to particular conditions, and I am not sure if it could be legally said that a concession not availed of or not granted by the authorities who were entitled to grant it, could be said to be a loss to the party which has not got the concession. The very term ‘concession’ connotes, I think, a granting on the part of one authority, to be availed of by another, and it also connotes, I think, a right on the part of one party to grant the concession. But that is on a technical ground.

“As far as fixing the responsibility in this case is concerned, hon. Members will realize the difficulty of having to go back for fourteen years to 1921 to find out who exactly was responsible for a particular mistake. In the case of officers who are now either dead or have retired from service, there will be absolutely no advantage gained by fixing such responsibility for this reason that it is not possible for us to bring to book dead individuals, nor is it legally open to us to proceed against the persons who have retired for recovering any loss which might have accrued to Government by reason of their negligence during their service. I think one of the pension rules is that we cannot touch any pension which has already been sanctioned. That being the case, for an omission which occurred in the year 1921, would it be reasonable to make any officer even if he is now in service and is available, answerable for it? Would it be reasonable that for any loss which has accrued all these fourteen years, we should bring to book any officer who has been in charge of this department between the years 1921 and now, unless we are able to show that there was occasion for him to particularly notice this matter and yet failed to take action? Moreover, Sir, when once a Government Order goes into the records, we do not expect an officer when he takes charge, to take every old order and every communication, and post himself up with all facts and figures. Certainly in trying to fix the responsibility, the Government have to adopt a reasonable attitude, and see if there has been any definite negligence on the part of any one officer, negligence

[Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam] [3rd February 1936]

which can be traced to him. In the absence of that, it seems to me, Sir, that we can only regret the loss which the Government have been put to and say that the matter should rest there."

* Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I am really very much surprised at this sort of argument put up by the Hon. the Home Member. He seems to have thought that he was arguing in a court of law in a case which he knew he could not support but in which he had to say something. He has not even taken the trouble to say whether the Government went into the question at least after the remarks were made by the Accountant-General, and whether they made any enquiries as to whether any particular person was found responsible . . ."

* The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—"I thought I stated that we tried to find out when the Government Order came and who were the officers at the time. I also expressed the difficulty in exactly fixing the responsibility for the act. It took place more than fourteen years ago."

* Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Not fourteen years ago, Sir. It has been going on from the year 1918 to 1933. This has continued as a recent event too. I am sure the Government will be in a position, if they care to make an enquiry, to find out the person who was culpable and to decide whether with justice and equity they can fix the responsibility on anybody. We are not told whether any such enquiry has been held, or whether the Hon. the Home Member is going to hold any such enquiry into the matter. On the other hand what he very speciously argues is that it is only a concession and it is open for anybody to take advantage of a concession or not. That seems to me, Sir, to be a very curious proposition. If a concession is available and if there is a way in which some money can be saved, certainly it is the duty of everybody in charge of the department to take advantage of the concession and save the money. But to say that simply because it is a concession, therefore it is open to anybody to avail himself of it or not, is certainly a proposition which I should, with very great respect, say is very unreasonable. I hope, Sir, that the Government are not pursuing a similar policy with regard to expenditure in other departments of Government."

"Well, Sir, the next argument he advanced was: We do not know whether any particular officer was aware of the Government Order or not; so we cannot make anybody responsible. That again, Sir, is the enunciation of a principle which I do not think the Government are well advised in adopting. They are issuing so many Government Orders and Acts; and if any officer is at liberty to say, 'I am not aware of the Government Order or of the Act' it will be intolerable."

* The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—"That is what I said about the intervening officers who were subsequently in charge of the department after the year 1921. You don't expect them to be

3rd February 1936] [Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam]

aware—it is not a mere Government Order alone—of all the communications that might have been recorded in the office.”

* Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—“That is exactly what I am saying. Supposing a Government Order is issued in the year 1921 and an officer takes charge in the year 1935; is it open to that officer to say that the Government Order was passed in the year 1921, and that he came to the office only in the year 1935? Is it likely that his explanation will be accepted, I should like to know. If that is the case, Sir, I do not know where we stand. It may as well be said that every officer is responsible only for the Acts and Government Orders which are passed after he takes office, and that he is not responsible for any other things. As I am reminded by my friend here, the officer may say that he is responsible only for such things as are passed in his time and which are brought to his notice by somebody. That seems to be a curious sort of principle to enunciate. I want to know from the Government whether such a principle is being followed in all matters or whether only in a case in which, as I said already, no explanation is possible, the Hon. the Home Member has now attempted this sort of lame excuse.

“Sir, from every standpoint, it looks as if the Government are not at all careful enough to look after the interests of the people, are not caring for the money in their charge, are not at all controlling their officers and are not taking any trouble whatsoever to see that the officers are properly doing their duties. At any rate that seems to be the result of the explanation that has been given by the Hon. the Home Member. The Government seem to think that they can do whatever they like and say: ‘Well, here we are just to put a sort of cover over the actions of our officers; this particular officer might not have known anything about this matter; he may not have been aware of what was happening; it is none of the duties of the Government to look to the proper spending of the funds.’ That seems to be the position. I am very sorry indeed that the Hon. the Home Member should have shown such want of care in the affairs of the Government. 4 p.m.

“Then, Sir, as regards the officers themselves, we do not know who are the officers that are concerned, and what they have done; but at any rate it is a matter in which the Government will have to ask for the explanation from the officers concerned as to why they have not taken advantage of the concession. Apparently, from the explanation given by the Hon. the Home Member, even that has not been done. If it is not possible to get the explanation of those persons who are no longer in service or have disappeared from the world, there are at least some people who are yet in service. I want to know whether they have been asked and their explanations taken and considered. It seems to me it is a matter of woeful neglect of duty on the part of Government not to have done so. I do hope Government are not taking the same sort of attitude in all other matters and that they are exercising more care in the affairs of the State. I do hope that even in regard to this

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [3rd February 1936]

matter, the Hon. the Home Member will seriously see what the explanations will actually lead to and what they mean and what rules should be laid down in regard to such matters."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise only to point out how unsatisfactory the note prepared by the Public Department is in this connexion. The whole thing seems to be an attempt to explain away the points that have been raised by the Accountant-General. The Accountant-General says in his remark that the order of the Railway Board was not merely a suggestion, but it was an order which mentioned that the concession should be recognized and allowed by all railways. While that is the language used by the Board, the explanation seems to be, Sir, that since paragraph 6 of the Railway Board letter contained only suggestions and not directions, it was for the railway administration and not for the Police department to take the initiative in the matter. I do not think this note in any way meets the point raised by the Accountant-General. It is not to be argued seriously that it was merely a suggestion. On the other hand, it seems to be a specific direction to the Railways that it should be recognized and allowed by all the Railways. When it is not a suggestion but a direction that the concession should be recognized and allowed, it was open to the Government to intimate the fact to the Inspector-General of Police and ask him to take action. Instead of that, the explanation is now forthcoming that it was considered to be a suggestion and not a direction; and to add to it, it is stated that it was the responsibility of the Railway administrations to go out of their way and grant concessions to the police force. That is really very strange, Sir.

"In the next instance, Sir, it is stated that the Inspector-General of Police was not communicated with. Perhaps the Inspector-General of Police is correct. Government ought to be in a position—I mean the Public Department—to give an explanation as to how the office of the Inspector-General was able to detect that this concession was not availed of. There seems to be no explanation from the Public Department as to how in that very office to which this communication was not sent—only paragraph 7 of the report was sent and not paragraph 6—the Inspector-General of Police came to detect these omissions by the department and how he started communication with the railway authorities in March 1933 and subsequently. Even on that point, the explanation of the Public Department is unsatisfactory.

"Then, Sir, the point which really affects the position, and that is in my opinion a more fundamental point, is the utter lack of co-ordination in this regard in the different offices concerned in this matter. That is a point which the Police department and the Public Department ought to bear in mind, namely, that there is no co-ordination between these two departments. That point has not been made clear in the note that has been placed before the Committee by the Public Department. I do not know what explanation will be offered by the Hon. the Finance Member or the Hon. the Home Member. They have

3rd February 1936] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

not shown us as to how exactly that lack of co-ordination occurred and what they propose to do in order to secure that co-ordination and avoid such things in the future in such matters.

“ Again, Sir, there is another point which I would like to emphasize, namely, the original order of the Government in which that letter of the Railway Board was recorded is missing in the records. Such a thing has happened before in the Forest department, when orders were issued by Government on a previous occasion to the Forest Engineer with regard to the disposal of timber, either in logs or in scantlings; and those very important and relevant orders were missing. Then, the theory was put forward that it was a communication by telephone, and even for that there was no proof. It was stated at the Committee that even telephonic messages were recorded on paper and then added on to the file; and even those recorded telephone messages were not available on the previous occasion. It only reminds me of these cases which I had to deal with when I was on the Public Accounts Committee one or two years ago. Here is a similar case when the original order of the Government incorporating the letter and communicating the same to the Inspector-General is missing. Government ought to be able to say how it was missing, and who it was that was responsible for this neglect; and when they detected that this missing took place and that the letter was not actually in the file.

“ There is, Sir, another point which I would like to urge on the Government. In the note it is stated that in March 1933, the Police Department took up with the railways the question of the issue of free passes. The South Indian Railway Company agreed in April 1933, i.e., just within a month; but the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway first refused and then ultimately in October 1933 they also agreed to it. Nothing is known as to whether the Government have recovered this loss of concession from the moment they started the agitation, that is, in March 1933 up to October 1933. I would like to know whether the Government have recovered from the railway company, which they are entitled to under law, the charges that they have paid from March 1933 up to October 1933, the date on which they brought to the notice of the railway administration that the Government Police was entitled to free passes; and when they ultimately agreed to give from October 1933, they are bound to give also from March 1933, because the orders already existed, and the Government ought to have been able to recover that amount from the railway administration from March 1933.

“ I would also add this, Sir. I do not know whether it has been done this year. Sir, in the Public Accounts Committee, the procedure in the Government of India is, the heads of departments and the Secretaries to Government concerned are sent for and examined on matters like this. In this province, so long as I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee, we had the help of the Secretaries and they explained with their notes, but then the head of the department concerned was never available to the committee. I do not know whether

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [3rd February 1936]

the committee which considered this report was able to examine any officer on points which arose in the course of the administration of his department. If the committee has not done so, I would urge upon the committee that they should in future make it a point to examine the officers concerned and find out for themselves as far as possible where to locate the responsibility and what should be done when once the responsibility has been located. It is really a serious handicap that the committee ought not to be able to examine the heads of departments who actually are responsible for the day-to-day administration. The Public Accounts Committee procedure that is laid down enables and entitles the members of the committee to examine the heads of departments. That is a healthy principle which I want should be followed at least in future years.

"Then, Sir, with regard to the responsibility itself, it is true that it cannot be fixed up. In no case have Government been able to fix up responsibility with regard to the loss that Government have suffered and public revenues have suffered. Probably on account of diligent scrutiny in the Industries department there has been some recovery ordered last year or the previous year, but barring the one or two instances, I must observe there has been no case where Government have been able to locate responsibility. Sir, the standing example of the inability of the Government to locate the responsibility and recover any loss to Government, was in the Forest department some years ago when more than 50 lakhs of rupees were lost to the Government in the shape of valuable forest, machinery and good timber. I would therefore urge that the earlier the Government set about reorganizing the co-ordination between the Secretariat and the departments and also providing for detecting cases wherein such defalcations appear, the better it is for the public revenues and the administration of the province. With these observations, Sir, I resume my seat."

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"Mr. President, with a view to make it conform to my original motion, with your permission, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment, to the amendment of Mr. Rameswara Rao under discussion:—

'For the words "that steps should be taken," substitute the words "that enquiries be made and steps be taken if necessary."'

This is a simple amendment. Instead of straightaway proceeding with the matter of recovering the amount as suggested in the amendment of Mr. Rameswara Rao I want that the matter should be first enquired into and steps be taken if deemed necessary and also if it is found possible to make the recovery, to proceed with the case. Even if it is not possible to recover the amount at this distance of time, such a matter as this requires necessary investigation and enquiry so that it may serve as a sort of lesson to the future generation at least to be careful that such mistakes are not repeated. I am surprised to hear the argument put forth by the Hon. the Home Member that this is not a loss and I think he will refuse to admit his own argument now after my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar, has explained the case

3rd February 1936] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

to him.. As a matter of fact, we find, Sir, that even in regard to payment of travelling allowance to Members of this House, such a condition is imposed. In case we fail to avail ourselves of any concession in force are we to take it that Government are prepared to pay us the full amount if the Hon. Home Member's argument is to be accepted? Anyway it is a loss and every one must admit that fact. So, an enquiry is necessary. In such an important matter where a considerable amount of loss has occurred to the State, I think it is not too much if I demand an enquiry. I therefore hope that Government will accept this amendment even if they are not prepared to accept the original amendment as it was moved. With these words, Sir, I move my amendments."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasaya:—"I second it. All that this amendment seeks to do is to see that an enquiry is held. It is extraordinary that the Government should not hold any enquiry because one can say that it concerns the Secretariat and the police. If it is some other department they would have ordered the enquiry and fixed the responsibility. We know of course in the Educational department under wrong orders issued by the Director of Public Instruction certain Deputy Inspectors drew travelling allowance which they had to pay to the last pie. Some of them were considered to be hard cases. Why not in this case? Is it because it is Police department and not the Education department. Why should the Secretariat not pay? Because the Secretariat is directly under the control of the Home Member he does not want to hold the Secretariat responsible. That is all. Therefore if an enquiry has been held Government owes it to this Council that they should say what enquiry has been made, the extent of the loss incurred and who is really responsible for it. If they find it difficult to fix the responsibility they may place the matter before the Council. All that the note says is that no action is possible. Why? No one can find the reason. The Secretariat people are the Pujaris and so when the time comes the demi-Gods want to excuse them."

4-15
p.m.

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"Mr. President, I find one remark only in the statements made by hon. Members with which I can agree and it is that departmental officers concerned in the financial irregularities should be asked to explain these irregularities to the Public Accounts Committee. May I tell the hon. Member that the same idea had occurred to the Public Accounts Committee and they made a recommendation to the same effect which has been accepted by the Government. As regards the other points I must join issue. I can assure the house that the most rigorous enquiry is made with regard to financial irregularities. When it comes to the notice through the Accountant-General or whoever it may be, the department has to enquire into it, then it has to run the gauntlet of the Finance Department who are always anxious to recover as much as possible and then it has to go before the Public Accounts Committee and after the Accounts Committee has gone into the matter very thoroughly Government have to pass orders. Well, if any officer after having gone through

[Mr. G. T. H. Bracken] [3rd February 1936]

so many enquiries as that escapes when he is guilty, all that I can say is, he is a very fortunate man. In regard to the particular case at issue, as already explained, it occurred sometime ago. The matter was gone into very thoroughly and I may state for the information of hon. Members that I know the names of the two persons who might have been held responsible. One is dead and the other has retired from service. And so now nothing can be done to either of them and no useful purpose could be served by mentioning their names. I cannot think the Inspector-General was at fault in not knowing an order which was not communicated to him. With regard to the document missing in the Secretariat, I find it impossible to find out how it is missing. I hope this Honourable House will see that every endeavour to get at the bottom of this financial irregularity, has been made and I hope in view of my explanation hon. Members will withdraw their amendments."

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I rather fail to understand what the Government mean when they say that one is dead and the other man has retired and therefore nothing can be done. Is it seriously contended by the Home Member that a delinquent drawing pension cannot be reached and dealt with in any way to recover what was due from him as in the case of one in active service?"

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"I am bound by the rules of the Secretary of State."

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I do not know if the rule is intended for all sorts of Government servants including the I.C.S. people. I am not aware of any rules unless the Hon. the Finance Member will satisfy me by quoting the letter of the rules that the Secretary of State meant, that any of his servants should be made to work in such a way that when found guilty of gross neglect or misconduct in the discharge of his duty he could easily escape. If the Hon. the Finance Member can quote the rule and satisfy us that is another matter. But if he wants to rely upon the Secretary of State's rules and wants us to believe his own interpretation of them, it is impossible for us to accept it and I cannot swallow such an argument by accepting his *ipse dixit*. I know the rules by which the other public servants are governed; and I know some public servants of the Government who are punished for no fault of their own in any public or official capacity. I will mention one instance in point. It is touching the case of a Police officer, a Police Inspector I believe, who was bound over to be of good behaviour by a Magistrate owing to some domestic quarrel with his brothers. This is in connexion with the incident which occurred long after his retirement. In that case the High Court held that it was not a case of moral turpitude and yet the Hon. the Home Member cut off half the pension of that officer."

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—"On a point of order, is the hon. Member in order?"

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member mentions an analogy which suits his purpose."

3rd February 1936].

. Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" I only quoted the instance to show how the Government do things as they like. I am not now pleading on behalf of the person to restore his pension."

" The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" On a point of order, Sir, the case mentioned was before the pension was given. In this case the pension had already been given."

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—" The position is this. If the fault had been committed after the pension was granted action could be taken; and not for fault before."

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" It is certainly more extraordinary than the first statement. I can understand a man during service being handled more severely than a man who is drawing pension, there being no power over him. By this if my Hon. Friend wants us to expect that a man in service can go uncaught whereas a higher standard of morality should be expected of a man not in active service, that is a proposition which I am unable to understand. I wish the Hon. Member for Finance would re-examine the matter for himself after this debate is over, and see if his own conscience or that of his colleagues can see any rational distinction between the two sets of cases."

" Next, Sir, the Hon. the Finance Member has not taken us into his confidence as to the estimated loss so far as the laches of the officers are concerned. I was going to mention the instance of a village magistrate who after collecting four annas failed to enter it in his accounts and so had not sent it to the treasury but subsequently the receipt was found out and then he gets six months for this slight oversight. This happened in my own district. Six months was the penalty for stupidity in not bringing to account a paltry sum of four annas. If that is so in regard to the subordinate services, in what proportion the Government should deal with highly-paid and much more responsible superior officers, who are reputed to be efficient and who should be beyond the criticism of everybody, if they cause loss to the State to the extent of lakhs, is a matter of mathematical proposition. In the one case, a man is awarded punishment of six months, while in the other he is simply left untouched! In the latter case he does not deserve his pension because his duty to the State was something and the actual performance was quite different. Again, if he is found guilty it means he does not deserve his pension and so recoveries must be made from it. It is up to the Hon. the Finance Member, if he believes that the rules are so strict and the officer is beyond his control, to address the Secretary of State to amend the rules, at least for the sake of his successor to maintain the prestige of the I.C.S. ranks. Again, Sir, there is another point in this matter which has been overlooked. It is one thing to say that they cannot deal with the Government servant in question, and quite another thing to say, as a matter of compromise or overture, they cannot address the Railway department. ' You granted the concession and it is up to you that you should conform to

[Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO] [3rd February 1936]

the rules and proceedings.' Certainly the thing is possible by negotiation with the Railway Board to get the State loss replenished.

4-30 p.m. "Again, the statement of the commercial proposition laid down by the Hon. the Home Member is astounding, and I leave it to some of my hon. Friends on the other side who are here to appreciate the commercial knowledge of the Hon. the Home Member. I cannot understand what he means by the word 'loss' or by the word 'gain'. If I am entitled to gain anything, though it may be as a matter of courtesy, it is certainly a loss to me not to get it. I know something of accountancy also. If I am entitled to claim what is due to me, and if I do not get it, it is a loss to me. It is only a commonsense proposition, and I do not know why the Hon. the Home Member labours to try to put forward an absolutely unacceptable theory of accountancy to justify the laches on the part of his officers or his subordinates whoever they may be. Therefore, the appeal of 'no loss' put forward by the Government is again, another astounding factor and I hope the Hon. the Home Member will not enunciate it for the benefit of the Government of the future. I hope he will have a clearer idea of 'gains and losses' and see that the State does not suffer loss.

"The next point is as to what the amount of loss is. Why should he not take us into his confidence and give us some idea?"

The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—"How are we to find out, Sir, now the number of sub-inspectors, inspectors and others who were on duty in 1922?"

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I sympathize with the Hon. the Home Member. My position is the accounts are there, the vouchers are there and the Railway Board is there. (A voice: 'Records are destroyed.') At least the records of the last six or three years will be there. You cannot brush out everything by saying that the records are not there and there is nothing from which you can get the information. No reasonable man can accept it. I again appeal to him as reasonable man at least to ascertain some information from the Railway Board and see how far they can replenish the loss. These are the points I suggest if the amendment moved by hon. Friend Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder is accepted and if the matter comes to an enquiry. I see from the statement of the Hon. the Finance Member that it is a closed book. He seems to suggest that everything possible has been done and that nothing more can be done. I take it that the Government is not for accepting the idea put forward in the amendment for an enquiry into the matter. Therefore, I have no option but to press my original proposition that recovery may be ordered from everybody concerned."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will first put Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder's amendment to the vote. The question is: that for the words 'steps should be taken,' in Mr. Rameswara Rao's amendment, the words 'enquiries be made and steps be taken if necessary' be substituted."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

3rd February 1936]

Mr. G. Rameswara Rao demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

1 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.	10 Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder.
2 Mr. Yakub Hasan.	11 „ G. R. Premayya.
3 Diwan Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.	12 „ K. Koti Reddi.
4 Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.	13 „ P. M. Thangal.
5 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.	14 „ G. Rameswara Rao.
6 Mr. Ahmed Meeran.	15 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi.
7 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.	16 Mr. C. Obi Reddi.
8 „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.	17 Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
9 „ K. P. Raman Menon.	18 Mr. T. Narasa Reddi.

Noes.

1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu.	18 Diwan Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
2 „ Rao Bahadur A. T. Pan-nirselvam.	19 „ A. Appadurai Pillai.
3 „ Sir Charles Souter.	20 Mr. W. K. M. Langley.
4 „ Mr. G. T. H. Bracken.	21 „ P. C. Moses.
5 „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.	22 „ P. V. Rajagopal Pillai.
6 „ Mr. P. T. Rajan.	23 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti.
7 „ The Raja of Bobbili.	24 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnada Sahib Bahadur.
8 Diwan Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.	25 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.
9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.	26 „ Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
10 Mr. W. Scott Brown.	27 Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.
11 „ H. R. Uzielli.	28 „ C. Basu Dev.
12 „ C. E. Jones.	29 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
13 „ G. T. Boag.	30 Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
14 „ R. Madanagopal Nayudu.	31 Mr. I. C. Iswaran Pillai.
15 „ T. B. Russell.	
16 „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.	
17 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.	

Neutral.

1 Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.	4 Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
2 Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.	
3 „ T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.	

Ayes. 18. *Noes.* 31. *Neutral.* 4.

The motion was lost.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I will now put the main amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end:—

“ and on such consideration, this Council is of opinion that steps should be taken to recover from the officers concerned, the losses incurred in public funds by their negligence between 1918 and 1933 and their failure to claim concessions allowed by the railways from July 1918, for Police force allotted on duty in connexion with the tours of His Excellency the Governor-General and His Excellency the Governor;” ”

The amendment was put and lost.

[3rd February 1936]

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"Sir, the second amendment I propose to move is—

'Add the following at the end: And on such consideration this Council is of opinion—

"that severe retrenchments should be effected in the office of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board and that the said Board should be abolished unless they pay up the loan advanced in accordance with the original understanding, and that the Board should have its budget passed every year by this Council".'

The reason for this amendment arises from what is contained at page 27 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. There we find:

'The Accountant-General has brought to notice the large amount of loan outstanding and the fact that, although the Government ordered that provision should be made in the budget of the Board for 1934-35 for the repayment of at least a year's interest, no payment has been received up to November 1934, and suggests that we might enquire what further steps are proposed to be taken to reduce the Board's indebtedness to Government. We are informed (i) that a sum of Rs. 11,344 had been paid by the Board (in February 1935) towards interest on the loans and that the Board expected to pay a further sum of Rs. 3,000 before the end of the fasli year; (ii) that the Government have considered the question of consolidating the principal and interest due on the loans given to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board and of permitting the Board to repay the amount in forty half-yearly instalments. The annuity payable under this arrangement will be about Rs. 34,566; (iii) that the proposal had been put to the Board and its reply was awaited; and (iv) that if the scheme is given effect to, it is expected that the Board will be in a position to repay the loans gradually without difficulty.'

"The point I want to raise is this. What are the original terms subject to which the loan was granted; when was it due to be repaid; what payments have been made by the Board till now and if no payments have been made, why have the Government waited so long while a loss has been inflicted on the State's finances? If the Religious Endowments Board is to serve any purpose, it should be first self-supporting, and then set itself to work to establish right relationship between God and man. If, as a matter of fact, the Board is to be another millstone tied round our necks to upset our finances, if the Board is not to pay interest on the loan, if years are to elapse in this condition and we are still to maintain the Board, I for one would say that the Board of Religious Endowments be rather abolished. I understand that when the Religious Endowments Act was passed, it was passed in a very irregular way. That was challenged . . ."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think no useful purpose will be served by discussing the history or the merits of the Religious Endowments Act."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I was not going to attack the proceedings of this Council by way of criticisms or make any adverse comments . . ."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may confine himself to his own resolution before the House."

3rd February 1936]

* Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"I was only going to say that as a result of this Act, the cost of litigation incurred in connexion with the administration of the Board is about one lakh or more. The question is whether the Government should pay or the Board should pay for the expenditure. I hear a vague rumour that there is a dispute between the Board and the Government. The Board says, 'your bad enactment has cost us so much.' The Government says, 'you are in charge of the administration and therefore it is your duty to pay the cost.' That seems to be the contest. I am not going to make any adverse comments against anybody concerned in the matter. I am only pointing out the financial aspect of the matter. If the Board is rightly to pay the amount, let them arrange to pay it; or if the Government accepts the liability, let them write off the debt. I am not interested in seeing a large balance being shown as owing from the Board. I should rather wish to know what is recoverable and what is not recoverable, so that we may have a clean budget for the future. In that connexion I was saying that the Religious Endowments Board and the Government must settle sooner or later as to what each should pay for the cost of litigation and what the outstanding loan will be and try to balance the budget. That is a claim between the Board and the Government. That apart, my first attack against the Board is as to why they have not paid even the interest due year after year and why they have accumulated the interest for years and still call upon the Government to advance further sums. One thing I know as a layman in connexion with the Board. The administration of the Board is something which is absolutely unworthy of any public administration. I understand, Sir, that some sums which ought to have been paid to the Board under the Religious Endowments Act have not been paid; that some cases filed before them ten years ago, have not been decided yet, and that some of the collections due long ago to them have not been realized. This is not another instance, I suppose, of 'a paper' being mislaid in the Finance Department. I used the word 'paper' not in the singular, but in the plural sense. This is not a case where nothing is to be traceable and therefore things which ought to have been done years ago have been held up all these long years, so much so that the Board has not been able either to support itself or to pay what they owed to the Government. I know a bit of it from the judicial standpoint. I know how the matter was exposed when the last Mutts' Bill was discussed before the Select Committee at Ootacamund, and the visitors who were allowed to be present then know how the administration of the Board was held up from year to year on account of the pending suits. A case was heard and closed, it was re-opened, re-heard and closed and yet no judgment delivered, so on and so forth for years, in a number of cases.

"There is an instance, which was hanging fire for over seven 4-15 years without coming to a final stage. If this is the way the Board p.m. administers its affairs, if they cannot set their house in order by proper internal administration or domestic arrangement, how can they.

[Mr. G. Rameswara Rao]

[3rd February 1936]

administer the executive side of it? That is what I call in question. I will put it in a drastic way: it is much better that the Board is dissolved instead of being allowed to survive in this state, functioning for the good neither of God nor of man. Just take another case to show the way in which things are administered by the Board. There is only one inspector for the Cuddapah and Anantapur districts put together. His fixed travelling allowance is Rs. 20 a month. He has to travel from Renigunta to another end which is in Mysore province. How on earth can Rs. 20 cover the expenses of this long journey from Renigunta to Bangalore? There are so many things in the administration which call for rectification, which call for modification, which call for serious overhauling if the Board is to function in working order. It is to emphasize this maladministration of the Board that I have brought forward this amendment, and I appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister to deal with it in the best way he can without prejudice to State finance and proper administration of the endowments themselves."

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"Sir, I beg to second the motion moved by my hon. Friend Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. Here we find that the Religious Endowments Board is not able to pay back the amount advanced to it. In spite of Government orders, they did not make any payments till November 1934, but subsequently they seem to have paid some amount, i.e., Rs. 11,344, and a further sum of Rs. 3,000 later on. I do not know whether these cover a small fraction of what they ought to pay. Now the Government say that they have calculated and arrived at the figure of Rs. 34,566 as the annuity to be paid in forty half-yearly instalments. I doubt very much, Sir, whether the Board would be able to pay that amount regularly when they are not able to pay any appreciable sum even by way of irregular instalments whenever they get funds. From this it will be seen that the financial aspect of that body is not quite sound. So it is a matter for consideration whether we will have to set this body right or whether we should scrap it away. My opinion is that if it is not conducted efficiently or if some effective steps are not taken to keep it in a sound financial basis, I think it is better that the body is scrapped, instead of allowing it to linger without serving any useful and effective purpose."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, Sir, you know how the Board came into being. There was of course a longstanding misuse or abuse of funds belonging to the religious endowments, and to set right that the Board came into being. No doubt it was intended that funds should be found to carry on the administration of the Board, but the measures originally taken did not enable the Board to realize the money due from the endowments. That is why there were large arrears; and until 1932, when the Act was amended and the provisions of the Revenue Recovery Act were extended, it was not possible to effectively collect the amounts that fell due. Both the

3rd February 1936]

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

Board and the trustees of endowments were put to very heavy expenses as the matter had to be carried to civil courts. That procedure benefited more the vakils rather than the Board or trustees of endowments.

“ There is another difficulty. The Board, I think, has been observing the strictest economy, and the staff employed is not sufficient to deal with the question. Of course, my hon. Friend, Mr. Rameswara Rao, has pointed out that demands are now being issued. It is so; because these things come to their knowledge now, they are issuing these notices; but if there had been sufficient staff, all the endowments would have been booked at once. As he said, there is one superintendent or inspector for two districts, that man has to travel over a large distance, and his allowance is only twenty rupees a month. How will he be able to travel to different parts where the temples are situated, take stock of the amounts due, and issue notices? That is why the Board has not been able to realize all its contributions. Now, the public are also not satisfied with the present state of things; most people think that the Board's services should be provincialized altogether and it should be treated as a department of the Government. Simply because the Board is not able to pay its debt for no fault of theirs, I do not think it should suffer. Nothing will be gained by their budget being placed before us, as is suggested. They are a statutory body trying to do their duties, and all that is required to be done is that the staff should be strengthened, so that effective action can be taken by the commissioners as well as the subordinate staff. Until that is done, the Board cannot function efficiently at all. The present state is due to the fact that the staff is not sufficient to cope with the work which is again due to the pressure brought to bear upon the Board by the Government. Therefore until a larger staff is employed, all the difficulties pointed out by Mr. Rameswara Rao cannot be rectified. On the other side, the Government should come forward with large grants to the Board to rectify these defects, and also provincialize the Board's services. That is the proper remedy and not the remedy suggested by Mr. Rameswara Rao. Therefore I oppose the amendment.”

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. President, I do not think that the mover really means that any drastic steps should be adopted, but he simply wants to draw the attention of the House to the defects in the present working of the Board so that they may be rectified. If that is what he means, I agree with him. I do not think there is any person now in this presidency or the sister presidencies who will say that this Board is not functioning for the good of man or God. I think it must be said to the credit of this province and the far-sighted statesmanship of the Raja of Panagal that a Board of this sort is working in our presidency, and we ought to be proud of the fact that the sister provinces are also trying to have a measure like this. What is more, even our Muslim brethren are agitating for a similar board. All these will speak to the fact that this board is necessary, and I do not think my hon. Friend who comes from near me really means that this board should be ended. All that

[Mr. M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar] [3rd February 1936]

he really must mean is that it must be mended. I practically agree with my Friend, Mr. Patnaik, that the commissioners of the Board ought to be provincialized, and that the debt which is existing—I do not know whether it is bad or good, let us not go into those legal technicalities—should be wiped off and the Board allowed to start with a clean slate. This will help the Board to make proper collections, appoint more staff, and stand on their own legs, and possibly they will be enabled to put by some savings in years to come.

“In this connexion I may make one remark, and it is this. As a matter of fact there are institutions which are supported by the aid of Government. For example, there are some Christian institutions which are depending upon Government for some sort of subsidy, and there are also similar institutions without funds. So why should not Hindu temples which the Board is now trying to put on a constitutional basis, be given some subsidy? This debt which is supposed to be existing for a long time may be wiped off so that they may start on a clean slate. That is the suggestion which I will in all seriousness put before the Hon. the Chief Minister to consider, so that the Board may work more satisfactorily in future.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The discussion on this will continue to-morrow.

“I wish to tell hon. Members that no more amendments on this Report will be received to-morrow.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. next day.

D. K. V. RAGHAVA VARMA,
Acting Secretary to the Legislative Council.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

3rd February 1936]

APPENDIX

[Vide answer to question No. 694 asked by Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmi-pathi at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 3rd February 1936, page 375 supra.]

Number of wells in the North Arcot district talukwar.

Name of taluk.	Number of wells.		Total.	Total ayscut irrigated by wells.	Area of taluk square miles.	Number of wells per square mile.	Remarks.
	In tank-fed areas.	In dry areas.					
				ACS.			
1 Vellore	5,337	9,649	14,986	26,536	432	35	One-third of the taluk is hilly.
2 Wallajah	6,762	11,373	18,135	25,345	395	46	
3 Arni	4,945	2,720	7,665	16,282	176	44	
4 Polur	5,512	7,914	13,426	9,586	589	23	More than half the taluk is hilly.
5 Tiruvannamalai ..	4,772	9,691	14,463	14,419	375	39	
6 Chengam	3,219	10,081	13,300	13,951	633	21	More than half the taluk is hilly.
7 Tiruppattur	4,197	6,456	10,653	15,497	581	19	Do.
8 Gudiyattam	6,481	9,913	16,394	28,895	481	34	One-third of the taluk is hilly.
9 Arkonam	4,237	5,283	9,520	17,575	319	30	
10 Cheyyar	6,416	4,598	11,014	13,674	328	34	
11 Wandiwash	7,638	9,287	16,925	25,503	340	50	
Total	59,516	86,965	146,481	206,263	4,649	32	

NOTE—The first eight taluks come at present under Mettur Hydro-Electric supply area.

